


JOURNAL
OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF LETTERS





University of Calcutta

Journal
of the
Department of Letters

25934

Vol. XXIII

891.05
J. D. L.



AH7

CENTRAL LIBRARY, CALCUTTA
LIBRARY, B. N. S. H.


Acc. No. 25739
Date 6-2-57
Call No. 571.37

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY BHUPENDRALAL BANERJEE
AT THE CALCUTTA UNIVERSITY PRESS, SENATE HOUSE, CALCUTTA.

C. U. Press, Reg. No. 645BJ—May, 1933—500

CONTENTS

	PAGES
1. The Indian Currency, by Prof. A. K. Sarkar, M.A.	1—40
2. Pratiṃālakṣaṇam, by Mr. Jitendranath Banerjea, M.A. 	1—84
3. Raja Ganesh, by Dr. Tamonashchandra Dasgupta, M.A., Ph.D. 	1—18
4. Dayārām's Sārādā-Mangal, by Dr. Tamonash- chandra Dasgupta, M.A., Ph.D. ...	1—30
5. Mahārāṣṭrī, A Later Phase of Śauraseni, by Mr. Manomohan Ghosh, M.A. 	1—24
6. A Skeleton Grammar of the Noakhali Dialect of Bengali, by Mr. Gopal Haldar, M.A. ...	1—38
7. A Critical Study of the Songs of Govindadas, I, by Mr. Biswapati Chaudhuri, M.A. ...	1—41
8. A Critical Study of the Songs of Govindadas, II, by Mr. Biswapati Chaudhuri, M.A. ...	1—63
9. A Critical Study of the Songs of Govindadas, III, by Mr. Biswapati Chaudhuri, M.A. ...	1—35
10. The Gīlakī Dialect, by Mr. M. Ishaque, M.A., B.Sc. 	1—34



The Indian Currency

By

A. K. SARKAR, M.A.

THE MAHOMEDAN PERIOD.

I. *The Pathan Coins.*

Naturally the Mahomedan conquerors of India brought with them their standard money of gold and silver—the Deenar and the Dirhem. These supplemented the Indian system in which since the days of the Kushans, the Deenars of gold and possibly of silver also were coined in imitation of the Roman Dinareus. (Bhandarkar, p. 201.)

The Deenar may be regarded as having taken the place of the indigenous *Suvarna*, though of varying different weights. (Bhandarkar, p. 181.)

Immediately after the Mahomedan occupation of India coins of silver mixed with copper were struck for purposes of ordinary currency. But the first Mahomedan coins had been struck, long before these Delhi-wallas, with the advent of Mahomed bin Kasim in Sindh in 712 A.D. They were coins of silver, mixed with copper, and thus keeping in with the general system of the Mahomedan coinage in after times,—the Delhi-wallas,—and modelled on the coins of the Kaliphs of Damascus and Baghdad. (Imperial Gazetteer, II, p. 143.)

These “Delhi-wallas” were afterwards accepted by the Pathan Sultans as subsidiary to their gold and silver money of about 174 grs. in weight. The use of these billon “Delhi-wallas” continued up to the time of Baber. The Pathans also had their own copper coin of the standard size as well as

its subdivisionary payments down to 17·4 grains or 1/10 of the full-weight unit. (Prinsep, II, p. 70.)

The Mahomedan conquerors imposed on the conquered Hindus heavy war indemnities calculated in their own "Dirhems." Mahomed bin Kasim exacted from Sindh and Multan 11,500,000 Dirhems which, according to Elliot, the historian, was equivalent to £270,000. Then a Dirhem was half a shilling or about four annas in value. Deenars were also used as units of calculation. (Prinsep II, p. 21.)

"The necklace was off the neck of Jaipal...of which the value was two hundred thousand deenars." (Elliot, II, p. 21.)

"The early Mahomedan rulers used the Arabic standards...the gold Dinar and the silver Drachma...copper and subsidiary coins for the indigenous standard." (Imperial Gazetteer, IV.)

The Ayini Akbari records the Deenar and the Dirhem as the ancient Mahomedan coins in India. The Deenar, was a gold coin resembling originally a date-stone but being changed into a circular form in the Caliphate of Omer. (Ayini Akbari.)

In addition to these Dinars and Dirhems of gold and silver respectively, there must have been prevalent on extensive scales, the subsidiary copper Jeetals and the billon Delhi-wallas to meet the demand of the petty trade in India in those days of proverbial cheapness.

The regulations of Alauddin Khiliji may give an idea about the cheapness of commodities and high value of money in India in the 14th century A.D. :

"Wheat	...	1 man (maund)	...	7·5	Jitals.
Barley	...	"	...	4	"
Rice in husk	...	"	...	5	"
Mash (Kalai)	...	"	...	5	"
Salt	...	2½ mans	...	5	"
Sugar	...	1 Sir (seer)	...	1·5	"
Brown sugar (Gur)	...	"	...	⅓	"
Til (sesamum)	...	3 Sirs	...	1	"
Butter	...	2½ "	...	1	"

In the unsettled times of Mahomed Tughlak the prices rose abnormally higher, some 50 p.c., but in the subsequent days of Firuz Tughlak they again fell near about the normal points.

"The Jital...is $1/64$ of a silver tunkah of 175 grs. or equal to a modern pice." (Thomas, Pathan Kings, p. 160.)

These subsidiary coins were, partly, newly struck by the Mahomedans and partly indigenous ones of immemorial antiquity. In certain parts of the country the cowrie shells continued to circulate and to count value in small payments and the Hindu Raktika was still the basic unit of the weight of metals.

Of course the numerous native states of that time, independent and semi-independent, continued to exercise their privilege of maintaining their own systems of money as an emblem of sovereignty as ardently as their descendants do under the present British regime.

For a long time to come the Mahomedan rulers continued to coin money of eclectic character, mixing their own legends with those of the Hindus, as a concession to the sentiment of the conquered as well as a means for easy circulation among the masses.

"...Mahmud of Ghazni...struck coins...remarkable for marginal legend in Sanskrit...His son Masud and his grandson Madud also struck coins copied from the bull and horseman type of the kings of Ohind...the prejudices of the conquered Indians were further humoured...certain gold coins...actually bear the image of the Hindus' goddess Lakshmi." (Imp. Gazetteer.)

Of these eclectic coins, perhaps, the most widely prevalent type was of the "Bull and horseman" device, which continued to be struck up to the time of Sultan Balban.

Mahomed Ghori, the ruler of Ghazni, became by right of conquest the ruler of India also. His coins, therefore, were minted both at Ghazni and Delhi: in Ghazni in gold and silver,

and in Delhi in silver and copper mixed. Most probably the indigenous coins continued to serve as subsidiary media in circulation along with the newly introduced Mahomedan coins which were either purely so or modified by the adaptive process of the inclusion of the Indian legends and language, and were named the ~~Delhi-wallas~~ to indicate their Indian origin in distinction to the Ghaznavite ones. The Delhi-wallas were minted at the different centres of the empire, at Delhi, Lahore, Gwalior and Peshawar. The Indian coins weighed between 38 and 49 grains while the Ghaznavite ones of gold weighed about 93 grains or so, and the silver coins were about 133 grs.

The introduction of the Mahomedan coins in India affected the indigenous systems slightly. The new coins "formed the models upon which the phraseology of the new currency was based, though in no degree affected the system of weights and value in India." (Edward Thomas, *Pathan Kings*, pp. 15-19.)

The old Delhi-wallas composed of the mixture of silver and copper continued in circulation and were "imitated and adopted with altered legends by Altamash and others."

Altamash was the pioneer to introduce the new imperial silver Tanka in India which closely followed the indigenous system regarding weight and value and became the standard money in silver as well as gold.

It is probable that in the earliest Mahomedan regime in India (in the reign of Mahomed Ghori) no gold or silver coin was struck in the country by the new rulers. The gold and silver of Ghazni, the imperial capital, as well as the indigenous Indian ones sufficed for big payments and "the Delhi-wallas or Chital," for the ordinary wants of the Indian population. (Edward Thomas, p. 37.)

The adaptive and introductory nature of the Indian coins of Mahomed Ghori is illustrated by the fact that the indigenous Indian coins with modified legends indicative of the

inauguration of the newly established Moslem sovereignty in India are extant.

The Kanouj gold coins bearing the legend, Mahomed bin Sam, on the reverse, along with that, Sreemad Govinda Chandra Dev, on the obverse corroborate the above statement.

Kutbuddin, the founder of the Slave dynasty, did not coin any money in his own name and in his time "the Delhi-walla or Chital" currency sufficed for all wants of the Indian population. (Edward Thomas, p. 37.)

Kutb ruled only for four years and possibly the currency, already brought into circulation, was found sufficient for exchange purposes and so no new coinage was necessary in his time. Moreover as during the greater part of his career, he acted as a subordinate ruler under the Ghaznavite kings, he might not have liked to introduce his own money out of respect for his tradition. (Thomas.)

The first period of the Moslem currency in India extends from the landing of Mahomed Kasim in Sindh in the 8th century A.D. up to the famous monetary reforms of Altamash in the thirteenth century. Of course, at the beginning the conquerors brought along with them their own money—the Deenars and the Dirhems. But these foreign coins were soon made to undergo various modifying and adaptive processes without which the currency could not properly facilitate commerce and exchange in India which had its own time-honoured and well-established system of currency. The legend, the technique, the weight, the composition, everything had to be altered more or less to suit the needs and tradition of the new possession. The Deenar was modified on the line of the Kushanas, and the Dirhem was transformed into the Delhi-wallas. The coins of this period, collected by the numismatists, show that the gold coins of Ghazni extant in India, weighed about 90 grains and the silver ones about 75 grains. But on the conquest of India the weights of both the species had to

be increased, and the Deenars came to weigh 125 grs. and the silver coins approximately to 140 grains, the weight of the traditional Karshapanas. But the most widely circulated mixed species of silver and copper weighed generally about 50 grains (near about the 32-Rati old Puranas) following the Delhi money. The Delhi-walla or the Chital money was coined extensively, and the pure gold or silver money only rarely, by the early Pathans. Copper coins have been found of 54 grains. But it may be presumed that these were coined with different weights to serve as subsidiary money. Possibly many of these were coined privately, without or with the tacit sanction of the royal authority, to serve local needs for currency.

The reign of Altamash may be regarded as of epoch-making significance in the history of the Mahomedan coinage in India. He coined gold and silver Tankas of 175 grains. These might be regarded as the direct descendants of the Hindu Satamana pieces and the progenitors of the *cidevant* Mohurs and the present-day Rupees. Following the earlier practice he also minted the small eclectic coins of the mixture of copper and silver with the bull and horseman device to serve as subsidiary to the standard money, on the traditional quaternary scale of 4, 8, 16, 32 and 64. It is probable that here originated the present-day relation between the Rupee and the Pice which is $\frac{1}{4}$ of a Rupee. This small coin was called Jital and its weight most probably was that of the modern Pice.

“ .. a tankah was equal to a tola in weight, whether of gold or silver, and a tankah of silver was equal to 50 jital. The jital was a small copper coin, the weight of which is not now known. Some conceive it was a tola; while others are of opinion that the jital like the pice of the present day, weighed of a tola.”

—Briggs, I, p. 360.

The discrepancy in the opinions may be removed by conjecturing that there were two different types of Jitals, most

probably at different times, of 1 tola weight and of $\frac{3}{4}$ tola weight, and if 50 coins of 1 tola weight were equal to one Rupee then near about 64 (66) coins of the latter type would be equal to the same silver coin.

But apart from these purely copper coins there were the hybrid pieces of silver and copper combined to constitute the subdivisionary system to the Tankah on the scale of 4 to 64.

—*Ed. Thomas*, p. 3.

Possibly the pure copper coins represented the smallest of these hybrid money—the $\frac{1}{8}$ (in value) of the rupee—and so far as this value is concerned, soon copper ousted silver altogether from the field of currency. It is remarkable also that Altamash's system of subdivisionary coins is reflected on the present-day British system of the pice, anna, two annas, four annas, and eight annas.

The Tankah was the indigenous name of the coins and its acceptance by the Mahomedan Sultan was of economic as well as political significance. India at the time of Altamash might be regarded to have begun its own independent system of currency, indicative of the autonomy of the new Moslem power.

There is much controversy regarding the origin and derivation of the term Tankah. But there cannot be any doubt that it had become indigenously Indian long before the advent of the Mahomedan power in the country. Even the great Mahmud of Ghazni admitted in his new Lahore Dirhems, the Sanskrit legend "tankah" on the reverse side.

—*Ed. Thomas*, p. 48.

It is certain that the modern colloquial "takah" is derived from the Tankah which was Sanskritised, if not originally Sanskrit, very early. At present the word is used in a generic sense of a coin of whatever value in many parts of India, while in Bengal it is only used in the specific sense of

a Rupee. In the Mahomedan period, as already has been mentioned, the Tankah was of silver as well as gold, and in the early British period there were golden Tankas coined, following the practice of the Mahomedans.

According to Professor Wilson Taka or Tanka is used to denote "a stamped coin in general" of gold, silver or copper.

—*Ed. Thomas*, p. 49.

According to the historian Erskine (*History of India*, p. 546) the term is of Chaghtai Turki origin. But the word is frequently mentioned in the Sanskrit literature and has been treated as indigenous. The terms Tanka, Tankaka, have been used to mean Rupee and small Rupee respectively. The word Tanka was surely the Indian name for coins when Altamash accepted it as the designation of his money.

The Tanka of Altamash was of 175 grains and in conformity with the full-weight Hindu coins known as the Satamana. The modern British Rupee is 180 grains and is also called the Tanka. It is notable that the Tanka represents the British, the Mahomedan, and the Hindu monetary systems.

Altamash coined both gold and silver Tankas and fixed the relation between them as 1 : 8. The Delhi-wallas and other kinds of billon coins were continued in circulation and "Altamash introduced abundant varieties of small change."

—*Ed. Thomas*, p. 53.

The coins of Altamash that have been unearthed by the numismatists, weigh near about 165 grs. which is the pure silver content of the British Rupee at present.

The ruling chiefs issued various types of the billon coins. Most of these were about 50 grains in weight and bore the horseman and the bull device. The copper coins generally weighed 25 grains. There were different types of gold and silver coins in circulation in different parts of the country. Billon coins of 25 grains and gold coins of 70 grains of the period, have been found.

It may be inferred that a greater degree of independence was allowed to the native princes in respect of the subsidiary coins. Thus while the Tanka was always imperial, the smaller coins were mostly local and belonging to the states.

In the reign of Rizzia, daughter of Altamash, the Delhi silver coins were first minted at Laknauti, the provincial capital of Bengal. "As Altamash seems to have been the first to provide an imperial coinage for Hindusthan, so Rizzia would appear to have taken the initiative in extending the silver currency to Bengal." (Ed. Thomas, pp. 109-10.)

It is recorded that the cowries sufficed "for all the wants of trade" in Bengal, before the Mahomedan conquest. This view of the Tabakati-Nasari is to be accepted with caution. It is a fact that Bengal used cowries in small payments during the Mahomedan period and this practice continued during the early British period also. It may also be legitimately presumed that in the pre-Mahomedan period the cowrie was a prevalent form of currency for small payments. But it is hardly possible that the Hindu rulers of Bengal, who were surely in touch with the outside princes, did not introduce the gold and silver coinage in their province, which was so much prevalent in up countries. The metallic money was surely prevalent and were requisite payments for higher values as well as in religious ceremonies.

The cowries were introduced in Bengal from the Maldive Islands. Edward Thomas quotes from Ibn Batuta the table for their calculation and relation to gold. But there are certain discrepancies which may be explained by reference to different periods and different localities :

100 cowries	...	1 Sia
700 ,,	...	1 Fal
1,200 ,,	...	1 Kutti
100,000 ,,	...	1 Bustu
4 Bustus	...	1 Deenar.

But sometimes a Deenar was worth 12 Bustus.

Again in Orissa ordinarily the counting of the cowries was the same as in Bengal at present, that is,

4 cowries	... 1 gunda
5 gundas	... 1 buri
4 buris	... 1 pana
16 panas	... 1 kahana

But sometimes 20 panas made a kahana.

The value of the cowrie fell in course of time. In 1740 a Rupee exchanged for 2,400 cowries, in 1756 for 2,560 cowries and in 1845 for 6,500 cowries. In the revised currency scheme of 1833 one Rupee was regarded as equivalent to 6,400 cowries. This was the case in Bengal. But Elliot records that one Rupee in Orissa was equivalent to as many as 10 kahanas or 12,800 cowries or double the number required for a Rupee in Bengal. Was the Rupee in Orissa a bigger coin—double the size of the Rupee in Bengal?

(Ed. Thomas, pp. 110-111, footnote.)

It may be interesting to make an attempt to reconcile the old Hindu metallic table of India to the prevalent cowrie table in Bengal at the Mahomedan conquest and on the advent of the British rule in the province :

I.	1 cowrie	... 1 Karsha of copper	
	80 cowries	... 1 Pana or Karshapana	} ... 1 Pice
	100 ,,	... 1 Sia	
II.	2560 ,,	... 1 silver Purana or Dhara	} Tanka Billon coins.
	2400 ,,	... 1 silver Rupee (Elliot)	
	2560 ,,	... 1 ,, (in 1756 A. D.)	
III.	6400 ,,	... 1 (silver Karshapana)	} Tanka. Rupee.
	6500 ,,	... 1 Rupee (in 1845 A.D.)	

IV. $6,400 \times 16$	10,24,00,10,000 rati or 175 grains of gold =1 Mohur or gold Tanka 100,000=1 Bustu=1 Deenar $4 \times 100,000=1=1$ Deenar $12 \times 100,000=1$ Deenar
V. 1,280	... 1 rati gold=16 rati silver=1,280 rati copper=1 kahana. Karshapana or golden Karsha.
VI. $1,280 \times 10$... 12,800=Orissa Rupee 12,000=Kutti (Ibn Batuta).

The discrepancies are many, but they may be reconciled to some extent by referring to the fluctuation in the value of the token cowrie. It may be noted that there is a significant uniformity in the various tables in the presence of 80 (pana) or its multiple 1,280 (kahana.) In this the Hindu Indian tradition is maintained.

It seems that the old copper money, Pana or Karshapana, of which the value was 80 cowries, reappeared in the new copper money, the Sia, Jital, Dam or Paisa. The old Purana or Dharana, the traditional punch-marked silver coins, of which the value was 2,560 cowries, reappeared in the new billon money—the Chital, the Jital, the Delhi-walla, the black Tanka, the Rupee. The 100-rati silver piece (the silver Satamana) reappeared in the silver Tanka or Rupee of the value of 6,400 cowries. The gold Karshapana is the Mohur or Deenar, or the Bustu of the value of about 100,000 cowries (102,400). The standard of calculation was kahana (1,280 cowries, 16 rati of silver or 1 rati of gold) and its most significant divisionary unit was the pana (80 cowries or 10 rati copper).

Altamash's Tanka continued to be coined by the subsequent Pathan kings in response to the needs of trade. The 50-grains billon coins were also extensively coined by them.

The attempts of Alauddin Khiliji on the currency were remarkable in two points—to lower the price-level by

regulation and to reduce the content of the Tanka from 175 to 140 grains.

This new coin, which was extensively introduced, was called the Adhali, possibly in reference to the reduction of its silver content (Black Tanka?). The old 175-grains gold and silver Tankas as well as the 50 grains billon coins were not altogether abolished but coined by Alauddin along with the new Adhalis. Thus it seems that the system introduced by Altamash continued in practice in spite of the innovation of Alauddin, without much change, till the monetary revolution of Mahomed Tughlak. Among the coins of Mahomed Tughlak a species has been found which is a highly alloyed silver piece of the weight of 140 grains. This may be the Adhali of which the value was only half of that of the standard Tanka of 175 grains. The surmise is supported by the very name as well as by the absence of any other half Tanka in circulation.

The regulated price list of Alauddin's time (see *ante*) shows that the purchasing power of money was much higher in comparison with that in the subsequent period of the eccentric king Mahomed bin Tughlak, when the price level was 50 p.c. lower. But the index number of prices again fell almost to the same level as in the reign of Alauddin by the time of Firuz Tughlak.

Per maund.	Alauddin.	Mahomed Tughlak.	Firuz Tughlak.
Wheat	7½ Jitals	12 Jitals	8 Jitals
Barley	4 „	8 „	4 „

Thus it seems that the extraordinary rise in the price level in the time of Mahomed Tughlak was abnormal and temporary and due to the unsettled nature of the time, and the regulated low prices in the time of Alauddin were normal and not a departure from the prevalent rates. The successors of Alauddin continued the system of 175 grains Tanka of Altamash and did not appear to have followed the innovation of

Alauddin in coining the Adhali which reappeared in the reign of Mahomed Tughlak.

“Mahomed Tughlak made several innovations. He issued heavier gold coins...and silver coins of about 140 grains and smaller pieces of 56 or 57 grains.” (Imp. Gaz., IV, p. 513.)

The reign of Mahomed Tughlak, who has been called the “Prince of Moneyers,” is remarkable in the monetary history of Pathan India for various reasons. He continued the old type gold and silver Tankas of 175 grains but, in addition, coined heavier and lighter gold pieces. The silver Adhalis of Alauddin, lighter silver pieces of 50 grains and the highly alloyed silver pieces of 140 grains, were coined in considerable quantities. But all these reforms and innovations were overshadowed by the introduction of token coins for the first time in the Indian currency. Thus the title “the prince of the moneyers” is deserved by the mad Sultan not for the variety of his coins but for his attempt to introduce cheap token money to perform the functions of the costly standard money.

It has been a historical fact that the system of the representative token money was not originated by the brain of the Tughlak prince and he had been anticipated by Kublai Khan of China and Kai Khasru of Persia.

“A paper currency appears to have existed in China two centuries before the Mughal conquest; and we find it in full force under the successors of Chengiz Khan, as it is described by Marcopolo, who resided in the court of Kublai Khan, from about 1274 to 1291, and by Ibn Batuta who visited China as Mahomed Tughlak’s ambassador about A.D. 1345. Kai Khasru, the Mughal ruler of Persia, tried to introduce the same system there in A. D. 1294, but failed. Muhammad Tughlak issued copper tokens instead of paper notes...and many of them are still extant.” (Elphinstone, p. 396.)

But the Indian Sultan's token money was more scientific in its nature, more carefully regulated, and formed only a small part of the total circulation. It had no reference to the standard gold money but was only token for the silver coin and thus designed to play a comparatively minor part in the field of the currency. The tokens were of cheap brass but their values were legally fixed and definitely recorded on their faces, so that no difficulty might be felt in recognising their legal position. But these brass tokens could easily be counterfeited as no perfect marks of authentic distinction could be devised for the royal issues. Indeed from our present-day experience of the counterfeit rupee, when the art of coinage has been made more perfect and when the organisation for vigilance has been much more systematised, it is easy to perceive that in the unsettled times of Mahomed Tughlak, the newly devised tokens were extensively counterfeited.

These tokens were speedily returned to the royal treasury for conversion into the standard silver money for more than one reason. They were a novelty ; the monetary ideas were undeveloped ; and there was very little confidence in the royal solvency. "The Prince of the Moneyers" however is to be absolved from any deliberately fraudulent or unworthy motive. He was only in advance of his time and so met the fate of the pioneers in all fields. His honesty of intention is patent from the facts that "in no instance were these representative coins ...to pass for...the gold pieces...no interference...contemplated with the existing circulating media and the proportion of the new coinage...must have been infinitesimal, in reference to the wealth of the kingdom." (Ed. Thomas, p. 240.)

Mahomed Tughlak's token money was of various kinds ranging from the representative of the standard Tanka of 175 grains to the smallest subsidiary two-kani piece. But the mostly prevalent form was the token for the Adhali of 140 grains. All these tokens were known by the common name of Dirhems.

Mahomed's successor Firuz Shah coined gold Tankas of 175 grains rather abundantly and replaced the silver coins of high value—the Tanka and the Adhali—in the circulation of the currency. He introduced a new system of subsidiary billon coins of silver and copper, of which both the weights and compositions were varied to make them suitable to serve as media for different fractional values.

It is probable that after the muddle in the reign of Mahomed Tughlak it became necessary to reform the system of the subsidiary coins so that the shocked popular confidence should be restored in them. The old system of the issue of mixed silver and copper money was now regulated in detail, perfected and officially recognised. The old Tanka and the new Adhali still continued in circulation as the silver money. Firuz cleverly designed subdivisionary coins to serve both these standards. Starting from the fundamental unit, the Kani, which was $1/64$ of the old Tanka he reaches the new Adhali by a parallel ladder. Thus his system may be regarded as still dual, following the old Hindu system of the Satamanas and the Karshapanas, and their respective fractional units based on the quaternary as well as the decimal process.

The complete table of Firuz Shah's coins may be shown as follows :

1 Kani	= $1/64$ of a tanka	of 175 grains	= 1 Pice (modern)
2 Kanis	= $1/32$	„ „ „	= 1 Double Fice
8 „	= $1/8$	„ „ „	= 1 two-anna piece
12 „	= $3/16$	= $1/4$ of 48-kani piece	= 2 Sashkanis
			= 6 Do-kanis
24 „	= $3/8$ of a Tanka	= $1/2$ of 48-kani	= 4 Shas-kanis
			= 12 Do-kanis
48 „	= $3/4$ of a Tanka	= 2 twenty-four-kani pieces	
„	= 8 Sash-kanis	= 4 twelve-kani	= 6 eight-kanis
			= 24 Do-kanis

Again :

50 Kanis	1 Adhali of 140 grains
25 Kanis	1/2 Adhali
10 Kanis	1/5 Adhali

In Mahomed Tughlak's time,

1 Kani...1 Jital... copper Fals (*cf.* Ed. Thomas, p. 219).

The Kani still continues to mean $1/64$ of an unit and is frequently used in measuring land. It is taken by some to mean $1/80$ instead of $1/64$. In the latter case it fits in well with the traditional Hindu system of calculation starting from the Krishnal, Karsha or cowrie and reaching the pana and Kahana. The 'fal' was a small copper coin $1\frac{1}{4}$ in value of the modern pice which was $\frac{1}{4}$ of a Tanka and equal in value to a Kani. It is quite possible that more than one variety of kanis were prevalent in the different parts of the country respectively.

The Kani was a coin of copper and silver mixed. It was possible for Firuz Shah to mint coins of so low values as $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ Kanis, only through suitable manipulation of the alloy element to make their sizes commendable for use. A quarter-Kani piece was equal in value to a Fal, and it seems probable that the former was only a money of account. Otherwise the complication of an unnecessary parallel is to be presumed.

In the above-mentioned tables two points are notable :

(1) The fundamental Kani was multiplied upward with the help of 4 as well as 3 to reach the Tanka, and with that of 5 or 10 to reach the Adhali, and thus the traditional quaternary and decimal systems were kept in view while, in addition, a new tertiary system was introduced.

(2) The 48-kani piece was almost equal in value to the Adhali with which it will be exactly exchangeable if a little alloy of less than 10 grains per coin (7%) be used in the making up of the latter coin.

The original introduction of the tertiary element however is attributed to the preceding Sultan in whose list is found Sash-kanis (6) and the Duazdah-kanis (12).

The admirable feature in the reform of Firuz Shah is to be found in the varying of the elements in the mixture of copper and silver so that the coins might be made more portable by the increase or reduction of their sizes as the case might be. These mixed coins, approximately of the same weight, contained widely different quantities of pure silver in them.

—*Ed. Thomas.*

There is nothing remarkable in the subsequent history of the Pathan coinage up to the time of Behlul Lodi. The gold, silver, copper and billon coins were continued to be minted and they were of various sizes, values and compositions. In Behlul's time there were some innovations of which the Behloli (coins) has left some notable mark on the Mahomedan currency in India.

The Behloli, a copper or mixed coin of 1 tolah, eight mashas and seven ratis in weight, is clearly closely related to the Dam of Akbar ($\frac{1}{16}$ of a rupee) and the Paisa of the earlier times.

—*E. Thomas, Pathan Kings, p. 360.*

“The Paisa, whenever it obtained its more modern name was simply.....the mere successor of the double karsha of the remote antiquity.....whose exact counterpart (is the) Egyptian ...2 Ket.”

—*E. Thomas, pp. 361-2.*

It is doubtful however whether any copper Behloli was coined by Behlul Lodi or whether he confined his minting to the billon type alone. As no such copper piece has been found it may be said that this billon type was replaced by Sher Shah with the copper Dam which was accepted by Akbar afterwards.

The Paisa or the Dam was a heavy copper money of much greater weight than the present pice (100 grains).

Mr. Edward Thomas has reckoned it to be equal to a double Karsha (160 rati or 280 grains). But the Dam of Sher Shah or Akbar was 323.5625 grains and so of much heavier in weight.

In the Ayini Akbari, the Paisa, Behloli or Dam has been measured to be equal to 5 Tanks which are nothing but the old Dharanas or Puranas of 32 rati or 56 grains. 40 double Karshas, 80 single Karshas or 160 half Karshas of the Pathans were equal to 200 copper Tanks of Akbar, which was equal in value to one silver Tanka. Thus the Pathan system was engrafted into that of the Great Mughal. 40 Dams or Paisas were equal to 280×40 grains = 11,200 grains while 200 Tanks were also equal to $56 \times 200 = 11,200$, both of which figures represented the value of a silver Rupee or Tanka of Akbar. (E. Thomas.)

But Elliot warns that the popular idea of Dam was different from the currency of the same name so important in the monetary system of Akbar :

3½	Dams=	1	Damri	
		2	Damris=	1 Chaddam
		4	„	= 1 Adhela
25	Dams=	8	„	= 1 Paisa
50	Dams=	16	„	= 1 Taka

Thus the Behloli (Paisa) may be regarded as a remarkable contribution of Behlul Lodi, to the monetary system of India. It reconciled the old Hindu system with that of the Mahomedans, as subsidiary to the Tank (mixed pieces) as well as the Tanka (silver).

Messrs. Thomas and Elliot have not noted that this, apparently, is a copper table. The "taka" is not the silver "tanka" but "dam" and is equal to a double Paisa or Karsha.

The Chaddam or Chiddam was perhaps the smallest actual currency and the primary Dam to start with. It was perhaps merely an imaginary money of account like the

krantis, dantis or kakinis. We have seen many such parallels in the monetary history of India. Even to-day people say emphatically, "I shall not pay even a Chiddam for this." The Damri, $1/16$ of the Taka, was more frequently used in calculation and was consistent with the Hindu method, and equivalent to an anna in relation to the modern Rupee, a chattack in relation to a kottah or seer. The Dam as actual money was distinct from the money of mere calculation of the same name and was called by the general name Taka or "money." It is a fact that all money in India, irrespective of their weights or compositions, were and are still in certain provinces indifferently called "taka."

If the Taka is the Dam of Akbar, its weight is 240 grains or that of double Karshas and the Paisa or half a Dam is equal to 140 grains or 80 ratis or a Karshapana or Karsha of a copper. The "taka" is even now called "the double" or equal to two paishas in up-country.

But Briggs says (see *ante*) 50 Jitals are equal to one Tanka (tola) of silver. Thus "taka" was also "tankah" and Jital was also "dam" or Pice.

Mr. E. Thomas is also finally satisfied that the Dam (or money of account of the Mughal financiers), is $1/40$ and not $1/20$ of a Rupee.

The coinage of Sekendar Lodi, Behlul's son, is also remarkable. There was a departure made regarding the weight of money which was now raised to 4 Karshas and thus the exchange between this new money (Sekendari) and the silver Tanka was now 20 : 1 and not 40 : 1 as between the Behloli and the silver Tanka in the former reign.

But this departure did not make any radical alteration in the system introduced by Behlul who substituted the Behloli ($1/40$ of a Tanka) for the traditional Kani ($1/64$ of the Tanka). Sekendar merely made his Tanka $1/20$ instead of $1/40$ of the full-weight standard silver Tanka. Thus Sekendar retained decimal system but doubled the value of

the subsidiary coin and agreed with his father in bidding good bye to the quaternary system of 4 and 16.

It may be said that "this Sekendari tanka is found to have formed the connecting link between the Behloli and the Dam of Sher Shah." (E. Thomas, p. 366.)

This oft-mentioned Sekendari Tanka was a mixed piece with small silver content (6 to 8 grs.) and, of course, quite different from the pure silver Tanka initiated by Altamash on the imitation of the Satamana or the Sataraktika pieces of the Hindu tradition.

From the still available coins of Sekendar it is found that they were approximately of the total weight of 140 grains and 80 ratis, the weight of the Hindu Karshapanas and that their silver contents widely varied.

The next great Pathan moneyist is the Afghan Sher Shah whose position stands in importance between that of Altamash and Akbar.

Sher Shah substituted the simpler system of the single metal coins for the complicated billon system so widely and almost uniformly prevalent with his predecessors. "The greatest reform made by Sher Shah was the abolition of billon coins, the value of which had to be determined by guessing at the amount of silver they contained and the substitution of pure copper." (Imp. Gazetteer, IV.)

His motive was to remove the possibility of fraudulent manipulation of the mixed coin to increase the revenue of the Government. The mixed system was particularly liable to deliberate depreciation through the reduction of the silver portion. Sher Shah's gold and silver coins weighed near about 165 to 180 grains, and thus were much like the modern rupees and the Mohurs and the Tankas of the later Mahomedan and the early British period. His copper coins were about 320 grains and were therefore near about the double Karshapanas of the Hindus.

Sher Shah's coins seem to be a little heavier than the standard ones of the Mahomedans. The average weight of his Tankas was 178 grains and not 175; his Dams were 323·5; his tolah was about 186 grains; and his masha was about 15·5 grains. Such variations in the measures, not only of value but of space, etc., are almost normal with the Mahomedans.

“The ratio of gold to silver which was 8 to 1 in the early Mahomedan period, and had fallen to 7 to 1 after the conquest of the Deccan by Alauddin Muhammad, had now become 9·4 to 1.”

—*Imp. Gazetteer*, IV, p. 514.

The exchange rate between gold and silver and copper in Sher Shah's time was about 1 : 7 or 8 : 72·5. This indicates a higher value of silver than in Akbar's time when the ratio was 1 : 9·5 and a lower value of copper than in the earlier period of Pathans when the rate between copper and silver was about 1 : 64.

It is remarkable that the value of silver had almost become double of what is stated in the Sukraniti of the Hindus.

With Sher Shah the Pathan monetary system ended and the Mughal system permanently began.

It may be necessary to pause here for a recapitulation of the Pathan monetary history of India, gathered from so many different sources.

The Mahomedan conquerors brought with them their Deenars and Dirhems. But very early they adopted the mixed money of India—the Delhi-wallas—to supplement their original and imperial gold and silver currency. They also had to adopt the Indian legends, technique and weights through the force of circumstances. Of course the parallel system of native Indian coins of the independent and semi-independent provincial rulers continued in circulation.

In the reign of Altamash the full-fledged Mahomedan unit was first started in India. His introduction of the 175.

grains gold and silver Tankas and his adoption of quaternary coins may be regarded as complete restoration of the Hindu system under the Mahomedans, which is implied by the very name of the Tanka. The great significance of Altamash's Tanka is the fact that it not only connects the Hindu Satamana with the Mahomedan Dirhem but that it goes forward to link itself with the modern British Rupee.

The Tanka became the system everywhere, of course, with slight modifications now and then ; and in every age, since that of Altamash, it has maintained its position as the chief money in India. The Rajput chiefs of Central India as well as the provincial Mahomedan rulers of Bengal, whether during the Pathan regime or the subsequent Mughal period, continued to imitate it, and even now it rules the monetary destiny of India in the British as well as the native states.

The next significant stage in the currency history of India is to be found in the step of Alauddin Khiliji to issue the 140-grain Tanka which was coined in large scale by Mahomed Tughlak.

This new Tanka was distinguished from the full-value one by the name of Adhali or the half, though in reality they were neither half in weight nor in value, always, of their old namesake. When they were pure silver, as most of the Adhalis of Mahomed Tughlak were, apparently they could not be half in value. But the significance of this reduced Tanka is more in the fact that they exactly represented in weight the Hindu Karshapana of 80 ratis, than in anything else. It may be presumed that as in the case of Altamash so in that of either Alauddin or Mahomed Tughlak there was a deliberate idea of assimilating the new currency to the old Hindu system. Not only the Tanka of the different types but also their subsidiary tokens—the Paisha, the Kani, the Dam, etc.,—indicate the attempts to reconcile the old and the new systems through the double process of counting by the help of ten as well as four.

But the most significant fact in the currency history of the Pathans, for which the "mad Sultan" Mahomed Tughlak was responsible, is to be found in his conception of the brass tokens to act as the representative Tanka in its full intrinsic value. Perhaps this was the first instance of an attempt to introduce token money in India and it was long in advance of any such attempt in Europe. Mahomed Tughlak's scheme failed not so much for any intrinsic demerit in the plan of reform itself but for its being far in advance of the time.

The monetary history of Firuz Tughlak also is interesting for his attempts (1) to coin subsidiary money in accordance with both the decimal and the quaternary systems of subdivision, (2) to coin more portable coins of mixed copper and silver instead of either metal alone, and (3) to vary the quantity of the valuable metal in the coin to easily fit it in the system of the sub-division adopted.

After Firuz Tughlak the Pathan currency history again became interesting in the reigns of the two Lodis—Behlul and Sikandar. What Altamash did in respect of silver money Behlul achieved in respect of the copper money. Altamash's Tanka became the standard monetary unit of the Mahomedan period and had connection with the Hindu Satamana. The Behloli of the Lodi Sultan similarly returned to the copper Karsha of which it was double in weight and gave the clue for the proper copper coinage to the subsequent rulers—Sher Shah and Akbar. This Paisa, Dam or Behloli was described by the author of the Ayini Akbari as equal to five Tanks each of which is a 32-rati silver coin or equal in weight to the old Purana or Dharana of the Hindus. In this respect also the Behloli links the ancient Hindu system with the Mahomedan. Sikandar extended the Behloli method by issuing the double Dams and by limiting the composite issue of silver and copper to one single value instead of various values as in the time of his father Behlul Lodi.

The next great monetary reform in the Pathan history was brought about by the versatile genius of Sher Shah. He practically adopted the Tanka of Altamash. His real reform consists in his rejection of the mixed species and in the adoption of the single-metallic basis. Thus he gave the clue to the great Mughal about his coinage. Sher Shah's gold and silver Tankas of $11\frac{1}{2}$ mashas, his counting of 40 Dams as equal to a Tanka and his ratio between gold and silver, all are reflected more or less in Akbar's system of coinage. Thus the Pathan money engrafted itself easily into the Mughal money.

The currency of the Pathan period consisted of coins of gold, silver, copper and billon. This was a case with regard to the imperial, provincial and local native coins. The weights were mostly 175 grains, 140 grains, 50 grains and their subdivisions. The methods of subdivisionary coins were either quaternary or decimal. There is a remarkable uniformity among the currencies of so many different authorities, situated so widely apart from each other in respect of distance, political status and original tradition. This fact is in strange contrast with the prevalence of some three hundred or more varieties of the standard Rupee in the early British period. This shows the integrity of the Mahomedan empire at its rise and early progress, inspite of temporary disintegration now and then, in contrast with the permanent disruption of the imperial authority and decentralisation of the political powers in the country, in the declining time of the Mahomedan period and in the early and unconsolidated British empire. This feature of the Pathan currency can be explained by the fact that the Mahomedans very prudently adapted their currency to the indigenous system. This Hindu-Moslem system was not only naturally accepted by the provincial Mahomedan rulers in their semi-independent territories but also by the tributary native Indian princes and their independent compeers.

II. *The Mughal Coins.*

Baber was the founder of the Mughal dynasty in India. But long before his time the Mughals had made incursions into the country. So their coins had been brought and circulated in the country as an intermixture with the Pathan types. As early as the reign of Alauddin Khiliji, Mughal copper coins with Devanagri letters on the margin came into circulation in India.

Of course Baber coined his own money in India to celebrate his assumption of authority. The Baberis or the silver coins of Baber weighed about 71 grains or 1 misqal (40 ratis) in imitation of the Shah Rukhi indigenous Mughal coins, and exchangeable at the rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per Rupee. (Thomas, p. 381.) Humayun continued to coin the same money and additional gold money of small weights (8, 10, 13 grains).

Unauthorised or permissible tokens of the royal money were coined in several subordinate areas without the mention of the name of the Sultans on them. They were generally about 140 grains of copper in weight and thus continued the tradition of the Hindu Karshapana, and were exchangeable at the rate of "80 to the old tankah, 4 to the modified Sikundari and 32 to the foreign Babari and Shah-Rukhi."

—Thomas, p. 384.

The genius of Akbar, the great Mughal, has left an indelible mark on the Mughal system of the government in all its various branches. Along with his revenue, military and administrative organisations, the monetary system of the empire was placed on a scientific basis with great care and ability and in this respect his position may be considered along with that of Altamash, Mahomed Tughlak or Sher Shah. "Akbar modelled his coinage on that of Sher Shah..."

—Whitehead.

Akbar's gold coins weighed mostly between 160 and 170 grains, and his silver coins, 178·25 grains. His copper Dam like that of Sher Shah, 323 grains. (Wright, XV.)

In Akbar's time 26 varieties of gold coins—from the S'hansah weighing about 101 tolas to the Zarah weighing only about $\frac{1}{3}$ of a mashah or 3 grains—were minted. Of these the Lali-Jalali or the double Mohur of 22 mashas and the Mana of three mashas were frequently mentioned, and the round Mohur of 11 mashas or near about 1 tolah was the most extensively prevalent form of currency.

Jehangir's coins of gold and silver were adorned with poetic couplets on them. He coined some coins of different weights, possibly to commemorate his reign but on the whole continued the system of Akbar. There was not much minting activity in the reign of Shajehan—the system of Akbar continued during the rest of the Mughal period. Perhaps Akbar's coins were coined by them, so no gold coins of Shajehan or Aurangzeb (of Agra and Akbarabad) are found to be extant by the Numismatists. (Wright.)

"Marsden has several gold coins weighing as much as 168 grains...correspond with round Mohur whose full issue weight would have been...170·5 grains...there are pieces...of 187·5 grains."

—Thomas, p. 420.

"We find coins of Akbar's reign dug up in various places, and some weighing from 170 to 175 grains." (Prinsep's Essays, Useful Tables, 20.)

The smaller gold coin units like the round Mohurs had their subdivisionary pieces formed commonly on the quaternary (but rarely on the decimal principle) such as $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{5}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{16}$, $\frac{1}{32}$.

The Zara may be taken as the smallest gold piece, $\frac{1}{3}$ in weight of a masha, and S'hansah weighing about 101 tolas, as the largest. The Imperial mint usually coined only three varieties—the Lali-Jalali=2 round Mohurs or 22 mashas, the

Dhan=11 mashas, and the Mana=3 mashas. The round Mohurs, approximately 11 mashas, was the current gold coin. (Ayini Akbari.)

The silver coins were of nine varieties—the Rupee of Sher Shah or Jalali of Akbar, the Darba= $\frac{1}{2}$, Charn= $\frac{1}{4}$, the Pandan = $\frac{1}{8}$, the Dasa = $\frac{1}{10}$, the Kala = $\frac{1}{16}$, and the Siki = $\frac{1}{20}$ of the Jalali or the Rupee.

“The rupee is round and weighs $11\frac{1}{2}$ mashas...introduced in the time of Shir Shah...perfected during the reign... Although the market price is sometimes more or less than 40 Dams, yet this value...is set upon it in payment of wages.”

“The Dam weighs...1 tola, 8 mashas and 7 Surkhs; it is the fortieth part of the rupee. At first the coin was called Paisha.”

“For the purpose of calculation, the dam is divided into 25 parts, each of which is called a Jital. This imaginary division is only used by accountants.” (Ayini Akbari.)

The copper coins were :

1. The Dam=1 tola 8 mashas and 7 Surkhs or ratis= $\frac{1}{40}$ of a rupee or 323.6 grs. (Rati=1.94 grs.).
2. The Adhelah= $\frac{1}{2}$ dam.
3. The Paulah= $\frac{1}{4}$ dam.
4. The Damri= $\frac{1}{8}$ „

“Mercantile affairs of the country were mostly conducted in round Mohurs.” (Ayini Akbari.)

The copper coins were widely prevalent and most convenient medium in the cheap Mughal India. They ranged in value from $\frac{1}{40}$ Rupee (a Dam) to Damri of $\frac{1}{8}$ dam. The land revenue was calculated in dams as the most familiar money to the poor cultivators in the rural area. But they were token and not standard money.

The Mohurs were of various weights and names. But their standard weight seems to be a little less than 1 tola or 11 masha, and value in silver about 9 Rupees, and in copper

about 360 Dams. Rupees were of three varieties—the Jalali and the Akbar Shahi of two sorts. These varied in weight but were near about $11\frac{1}{2}$ mashas. Their values ranged between 40 to 38 Dams. The silver coins ranged in their varieties from the Rupee of $11\frac{1}{2}$ mashas to the Kala of $\frac{1}{16}$ of a Rupee. There was an additional variety, the sukhi or $\frac{1}{20}$ of a rupee. It falls outside the ordinary quaternary method of subdivision but had efficacy as equal to a double Dam and as bringing the quaternary to the decimal system of calculation.

Thus in Akbar's time the medium of exchange was composed of gold Mohurs, silver Rupees and copper Dams and their subdivisionary parts. There were 26 varieties of gold coins, 9 varieties of silver coins and at least 4 varieties of copper coins.

The coins were struck in the different parts of the empire, and on the authority of Ayini Akbari we learn that in Akbar's reign "gold coins were struck at Delhi, Ahmedabad, Bengal and Kabul; and silver and copper coins were coined in those and many other places."

Akbar's gold and silver coinage was modelled on that of Sher Shah and continued to be the model throughout the whole of the Mughal period and up to the present day in the British period. But his copper coinage may be traced further back, in origin, to Behlul Lodi's Dam. Of course its immediate prototype could be found in the Dam of the famous founder of the Suri dynasty. (Whitehead.)

The Ilahi coins of Akbar, which were initiated in the thirteenth year of his reign, were remarkable as inaugurating a new era in the Mahomedan coinage of India. The new creed of the great Mughal—"Akbar Jalla Jallali" (God is most great, eminent in his glory) was inscribed on them. Some more coins of Akbar were decorated with designs taken from life such as duck, hawk, etc., or like the deities of the Hindu mythology like Ram, Sita. The Ilahi coins are also remarkable for their fine workmanship. (Whitehead.)

Here an important question arises for discussion. What was the standard of value in Akbar's time or for the matter of that in the Mahomedan period—gold, silver or copper or any two or all of the three metals?

Mr. Moreland in his "India at the Death of Akbar" seems rather uninclined to allow that gold was one of the standards of value. He thinks that copper and silver might have been the two independent standards. He also thinks that gold coins were rarely in circulation. But the *Ayini Akbari* expressly records that the "mercantile affairs of the country were mostly conducted by the round mohurs."

—*Ayini Akbari*, p. 17.

".....By means of gold, man carries out noble plan,..... Gold has many valuable qualities...its component parts are nearly equal in weight...Nor can any of the four elements injure it...retains for ages its appearance...whereby gold is distinguished from the other metals...Among its epithets I may mention "the guardian of justice;" "the universal adjuster;"—and "indeed the adjustment of things depends on gold, and the basis of justice rests upon it. To render it justice God has allowed silver and brass to come into use..."

As against the view so definitely expressed in the *Ayini Akbari*, a high authority on the Indian Numismatics, Mr. Edward Thomas, holds that the "dam was understood to form the unit or standard in all exchanges."

"To show how completely the dam was understood to form the standard of the unit in all exchanges, it may be noticed, that, practically, the dam was the ready money of prince and peasant. Abul Fazl relates that a crore of dams were kept ready for gifts, etc., within the palace "every thousand of which was kept in bags." (The Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 421, F. note.)

But apart from the valuable, almost conclusive, evidence quoted above from the *Ayini Akbari*, the case for gold may be

judged on its own merit. The Mohur seems to be the generic name of all kinds of gold coins in the Mahomedan period, and of the twenty six varieties of Mohurs struck in the reign of Akbar, the widely current ones were the round Mohurs, the Dhana and the Mana, and perhaps also the Lali Jalali or the Double round Mohurs. Of these the first two varieties contained only about 11 mashas of gold (Rs. 9 or 360 Dams). The third variety the Mana, contained only three mashas of gold (Rs. 2-8-0 or 100 Dams). —Thomas, p. 425.

The last-mentioned piece might have been too small a piece for convenience of transactions, but the other coins were undoubtedly very convenient, for any transaction involving considerable value or distance, because of their comparative lightness, particularly in those days of hazardous and troublesome communication between the different parts of the vast empire.

The unique suitability of gold—from its high value in small bulk, lasting freshness, minute divisibility, easy malleability, intrinsic attractiveness, etc.—to serve as the basis of the medium of exchange is well known. For these qualities, in course of the long evolution, it has come to be accepted by modern times as the standard money *par excellence*. The virtues of gold were not unknown to the Mahomedans, and the author of the Ayini is all praise for the “sacred” metal, which he definitely enjoins “as the universal adjuster” of values, in which function to assist, brass and silver have come into existence.

“For many years gold and silver coins were struck in pure metals of equal weights.” (Imperial Gazetteer, IV, p. 513.)

As early as the reign of Altamash gold was coined as standard and current money along with silver. Numerous instances may be quoted from the history of the Mahomedan period to show that gold was extensively used as medium of

exchange in ordinary transactions as well as payment of revenues and tributes. So it can hardly be imagined that by some mysterious retrogressive move the gold money in the enlightened regime of the Great Moghul in India was relegated to the backward position of uncurrent and subsidiary money. The subsequent coinage and use of gold as standard money recorded by the early British writers on the Indian currency system surely indicate against the view that not gold but copper was the standard of value at the time of Akbar. Neither is there any record to show when gold was rehabilitated in its superior position in which the early British in India undoubtedly found it.

Even to-day in Bengal, and possibly in other parts of India also, the Akbari Mohurs are prized as money *par excellence* and auspicious.

Tavernier says gold and silver were money in India and coined by the royal mints in Aurangzeb's time. Transactions could be made in gold or in silver.

"Before (the British period) the money of India consisted of both gold and silver ... since the time of Akbar ... the units of currency had been the gold mohur and the silver rupee. Both coins ... 175 grains Troy ... the mohur and the rupee bore a fixed ratio ... as a consequence of being fixed to the same thing ... the mohur and the rupee, circulated at a fixed ratio ... In the Southern India ... silver was quite unknown. The Pagoda, the gold coin of the ancient Hindu kings, was the standard of value and the medium of exchange, and continued to be so till the time of the E. I. Company"

—*Ambedkar, Problem of the Rupee*, pp. 3-4.

"A variety of gold coins were current during the period ... the gold mohur of Bengal ... and the gold rupee, half rupee and quarter rupee ... The E. I. Company tried to maintain gold and silver in circulation at a fixed rate ... Up to

the end of the eighteenth century the gold coins circulated freely.”

—*The Imp. Gazetteer*, IV.

“They classified the jewels ... Rifles ... first class ... not less than 1000 mohurs in value.”

—*Ayini Akbari*, p. 15.

“The currency of Southern India was gold which was ... the chief circulated medium ... the standard coin ... Varahu or Hun ... in European writings. Pagoda ... equal to $3\frac{1}{2}$ of Akbar's rupees ... a smaller gold coin ... Fanam and subsidiary coins of silver and copper were in circulation.”

—*Moreland*, p. 54.

Akbar, who coined twenty-six varieties of Mohurs and made scientific arrangements for refining the metal and elaborate regulations for its minting and for maintaining the ratio of coined silver and copper with gold, can hardly be expected to have abandoned the gold standard in favour of the baser metals, silver and copper. During the disruption of the empire gold coins were current in northern India, and particularly the gold Huns in Southern India, held its position as the standard money. The Hun was extensively coined by the Mahrattas, and the early British authorities accepted it as money of unlimited legal tender. Not only at the end of the eighteenth century gold coins circulated freely, as is mentioned in the official *Gazetteer* of the British administration, but from the same authority it is conclusively proved that gold was accepted along with silver as standard of value in India by the East India Company which coined gold rupee, half rupee and quarter rupee under the regulation of 1818.

It may be pertinent to put a question to Mr. Moreland who thinks that “the coins in regular use were silver and copper” and not gold in Akbar's India, when gold money came to be regarded as standard of value?

It is necessary here to quote Mr. Moreland more extensively :

“ The copper coins were not as now tokens, but, like the silver, circulated at the value of the metal they contained, and consequently there were two independent standards (or three if we include gold), the rates of exchange between which might vary from time to time or place to place.”

—*Moreland, Akbar*, p. 55.

“ The land revenue was paid mainly in silver...remitted to the Moghal court in the same form...The entire revenue of Bengal is given in the Ayini Akbari as close on 150 lakhs of rupees.”

—*Moreland, Aurangzeb*, p. 180.

“...gold and copper...circulated as currency on the basis of their value as commodities”—p. 182.

“ The official rate of Akbar's time was 40 dam, that is 80 Gujrat pice, for a rupee, equivalent to 32 pice for a Mahmudi.”

Moreland, Aurangzeb, p. 183.

Juma-dami was estimated in Dams but Nasils were given in Rupees. Hasil Kamil is translated as standard revenue and Pasil sunwat or Amali as “ Current revenue.” It is clear from the Ayini that the actual assessment of revenue was made in copper, not silver, though the sum assessed was payable in either metal. (*Moreland*.)

“ The coins in regular use were silver and copper. Gold coins were also struck, but most of the twenty-six denominations may be described as “ fancy ” and three which were struck regularly were rarely found in circulation, being too large for transactions, and being sought mainly to be hoarded.” (*Moreland, India at the Death of Akbar*, p. 54.)

As has already been said historical evidence contradicts Mr. Moreland's idea that gold money was rarely in circulation. It was extensively in circulation before, in, and after

Akbar's time. Retail transactions in small values were of course conducted through the mediation of the less valuable money of copper and silver, as in the present day in India as well as other countries, but all transactions involving big values were more conveniently managed by the help of gold. The subsidiary gold coins were struck with a purpose and that purpose was not to serve hoarding. The quarter Mohur was not of such a high value as to be unfit to be used in retail transactions and the Zara, which was one-third of a masha in weight was certainly suitable for small transactions. In the subsequent period the currency of the gold stars in the Deccan surely indicates the possibility of the useful prevalence of the Zara in Akbar's time.

A great point is made, by certain writers, of the fact that the Dam was utilised in computing the land revenue of Akbar, in favour of the contention that copper and not gold was the standard of value in his time. At present in India all revenue is computed in rupee and the budget is calculated in Rupee, but not the Rupee but the pound sterling is the standard of value in India. Again payment of revenue was made in kind in the Mahomedan period and in Akbar's time the money commutation was brought into practice. For the ryots who had to pay small money-value of their revenue in kind it was convenient as well as simple to be assessed in Dam, and as the Zemindars were nothing but the farmers of revenue they were consistently assessed in Dams rather than in Mohurs or Rupees.

It is quite possible that no present-day distinction could be made between the standard gold money and the token silver or copper money in that period, but all the three ran *pari passu* with equal status. But even then gold was regarded as money *par excellence*, and was full legal tender and readily acceptable, and therefore extensively current in the country. There is no evidence to the contrary but rather enough to support this view. According to the Imperial

Gazetteer the silver and copper coins were regarded as "subsidiary" in India in the 18th century. (IV, p. 576.)

It is possible that there may have been a confused idea about "Standard money" in the minds of some of the earlier writers. But it is inexplicable why Mr. Moreland, who has surely a clear idea of what is meant by standard of value in modern times, thinks that chiefly copper was the standard of value in Akbar's time, and that gold was probably token money.

In view of the opinion expressed by him, however, it may not be altogether irrelevant here to discuss the accepted meaning of the term "Standard money" or "Standard of value."

"In comparing values of different commodities, recourse is generally had to the expression of the value of each in terms of some one commodity chosen as a "Standard of reference." This one commodity serves as a value measure, the value of any commodity being expressed by stating the quantity of "the standard" whose value is equal to that of some definite amount of the particular commodity...This reference of all values to one standard is specially convenient ...It is very obvious that the stability of value is a highly desirable quality in the standard."

—*Dictionary of P. Economy*, III, p. 109.

"Standard of value has reference...to the choice of a material which shall be available as a medium of exchange and shall provide a fixed and unchangeable standard for contracts extending over long periods of time. It is by no means a matter of necessity that the medium of exchange should be this standard of value, though it is a matter of convenience that it should be so."

—*Dictionary of P. Economy*, III, p. 597.

"A distinction must be made between standard money, money of account and current money. The standard money

may be gold, the money of account may be silver, and the current medium of exchange may be paper. The standard money may be that to whose value the value of other kinds of money is referred for determination, but it may not be coined. The money of account is that in which prices are usually expressed, and the current money is that in which actual payment is made. In England the standard is the gold sovereign...Accounts are sometimes reckoned in guineas...while money actually used in payment may be either gold, silver or paper."

—Kinley, *Money*.

"In its first form money is simply any commodity esteemed by all persons...which every person desires to have by him...in order that he may have the means of procuring necessities of life at any time...one article may be selected as money *par excellence*...This article will then begin to be issued as a measure of value...so that all exchanges will most readily be calculated and adjusted by comparison of the money value of the things exchanged."

—Jevons, p. 46.

But gold was not only the standard money but it was also one of the current moneys in the Mahomedan period as well as in the time of Akbar. Ambedkar writes in his *Problem of the Rupee*, "Before the British period the money of India consisted of both gold and silver. Under the Hindu emperors, the emphasis was laid on gold while under the Mahomedans silver formed a large part of the circulating medium. Since the time of Akbar...the units of currency had been the gold mohur and the silver rupee...In Southern India silver was quite unknown...The pagoda, a gold coin, was the standard of value...and continued till the time of the E. I. Company." —pp. 3 and 4.

The revenue of Akbar was represented in copper, it may be, for the reason, as has already been said, that it had to be collected in small values. It might have been the convenient

money of account. But for that reason to call it the standard money is not justifiable. The cheapness of the period might have made copper the current money in the rural areas and in towns also in cases of small payments and so "bags of copper" might have been always kept in readiness in the royal treasury but from that it can hardly be concluded that copper was the only standard of value.

Price List of Akbar's Time.

1. Wheat	...	1 Maund	...	12 Dams
2. Rice	...	"	...	20 "
3. Pulses	...	"	...	18 "
4. White sugar	...	"	...	128 "
5. Ghi	...	"	...	105 "
6. Sesamum oil	...	"	...	80 "
7. Salt	...	"	...	16 "

(Akbar's man (maund) = 40 sirs = weight of 30 dams = 388, 275 grains...about $\frac{1}{2}$ a hundred-weight.)

Cost of Labour.

1. Brick-layers	...	1 day...	7 to 4 Dams
2. Carpenters	...	" ...	7 to 2 "
3. Ordinary labourers	...	" ...	2 "

—Thomas, *Pathan Kings*, pp. 429-30.

As much has been made of Akbar's revenue being computed in Dams, to prove that copper was the standard money, it may be mentioned here that Abul Fazl estimates the revenue in Dams (5.68 Arbs, arbuds or 100 crores). Nizamuddin Ahmed (in 1593 A.D.) returns it in 640 krores of Tanka Muradi (Sikandari or $\frac{1}{20}$ of silver Tanka) or 32 krores silver Tanka. (Thomas.)

"Up to the end of the eighteenth century gold coins circulated freely, and a large portion of the revenues was paid in gold...In Madras, down to 1818, the currency was based

upon the gold pagoda, inherited from the Hindu rulers of Southern India." (Imp. Gaz., IV, p. 516.)

Thus it seems that the Mahomedans did not invariably compute their revenues in copper but in silver also. It may also be suggested that the Dam as the cheapest and so most widely current money was the best to be recognised as the commutation for payments in kinds which was historically the prevalent form of revenue before Todar Mall's settlement. Rupee is now the prevalent form of paying revenue in British India but it is not the standard of value. The cowrie was the prevalent form of money-payment in the mediaeval and even in the early British Bengal. Was cowrie the standard of value?

The system of Akbar, which in itself was a direct continuation of the reformed currency of Sher Shah, continued with slight modifications and additions throughout the whole of the Mahomedan period.

"The compositions of the rupee did not vary...it contained about 175 grains...Jahangir coined a rupee heavier by 20 grains..." (Moreland, From Akbar to Aurangzeb, p. 329.)

"The coins of the Mughal empire were struck in gold, silver and copper...Sher Shah initiated currency reforms. It is from his reign that we must date the introduction of the gold mohur and silver rupee in the form and size they maintain throughout the Mughal dynasty and to the present day."

—Whitehead.

Of course, the field for the circulation of money expanded with the growing progress of time and more coinage was required.

It appears that Jehangir struck only gold and silver coins and not copper ones. Possibly the reason for this was in the fact that the abundant copper issues of Sher Shah and

Akbar were still sufficient to do the minor monetary works in the markets for three or four generations. After Akbar, Aurangzeb, and then Shah Alam II, seemed to have found the urgency of extensively coining copper again. (Whitehead.)

Jehangir's coins were remarkable for their excellence of workmanship and variety. A few of them were heavier than the coin ordinarily in circulation which were about 175 grains in weight. Five-, ten- or 100- and 200-Mohur pieces were struck as extraordinary issues. Gold and silver coins with poetical epigrams, with the name of the beautiful Nurjehan or with Zodiacal signs, were some of the interesting varieties of Jehangir's coins.

After Jehangir, Shah Jehan also issued certain varieties of gold and silver coins. Of these his little Nissans (largesse money) were very abundant.

"The monetary issues of Aurangzeb are monotonous in character." There was made alteration in the legend, the "Kalima," which was a common feature of all Mahomedan coins. The short-lived rulers of the Mughal dynasty after Aurangzeb could not show any originality or novelty in their coinage. The empire was disrupting and the currency was being decentralised and authorities other than the Mughals began to coin their own different moneys, and by the time of the establishment of the British regime numismatists, as well as economists, administrators as well as the general public, were bewildered by the currency of three hundred, according to some 700, varieties of rupees.

One remarkable fact however requires repetition, that inspite of all these differences the monetary current continued in the level initiated by Altamash on the model of the Hindu Satamana, reformed by Sher Shah, and improved by Akbar, and it still continues in the same way, near about the 175 grs. of weight in silver, and in gold also so long as gold was coined in India.

In Aurangzeb's time not less than seventy mints were engaged in the different parts of the Mughal empire. In addition to these the independent and the semi-independent states had their own organisations for coining money. During the declining period of the Mahomedan rule the provincial satraps became more or less independent of the central authority, and along with the assumption of the other insignia of royalty they began to coin money in their own names and in their own mints.

“In the early days of the Mahomedan rule coins appear to have been chiefly struck at Delhi...as independent states arose...the kings of these struck coins at one or more cities . . Sher Shah set numerous mints...In Aurangzeb's reign coins were issued from about seventy mints and the total number of places at which Mughal coins were struck in the whole period from Akbar to Bahadur III, is about 200. In the latter period however many of the mints belonged practically to independent viceroys or to the Mahratta and other states. In the local mints the coinage was gradually debased...until the whole country was filled with a bewildering collection of rupees of different values.”

—*Imp. Gazetteer*, IV, p. 514.



FRONTISPIECE.

PRATIMĀLAKSANAM*

BY

JITENDRA NATH BANERJEA, M.A.

Introductory Remarks.

The Indian artists, like the artists of other countries,¹ followed from a very early time some definite canons of proportion in the carving of images. The *Purāṇas*, *Tantras*, *Āgamas* and *Silpaśāstras* contain these details which were worked out by the sculptors. It is very difficult to determine the exact date of many of these texts; it is probable, however, that the *Silpaśāstras* in general were compiled at a comparatively late period, though a very considerable portion of the materials they contain is much earlier in point of date than the age of their compilation. Of these texts on iconometry, a section of the chapter 57

* The original of this text which is being edited here is in the collection of the Darbar Library of Nepal. A copy of it was secured sometime ago by Dr. P. C. Bagchi, M.A., D.ès.Lettres, of the Calcutta University, who has kindly allowed me to edit it. It will be of interest to note here that this text was not only rendered in Tibetan and had, thus, found its place in the '*Tanjur*,' Tib. *bsTangyur*, literally "The translated doctrine," but was also translated into Chinese. The Chinese translation was brought by Dr. Kalidas Nag, M.A., D.Litt., of the Calcutta University from China and is now with Dr. Bagchi. I am indebted to the latter for his kindly comparing for me the Sanskrit original with its Chinese and Tibetan versions.

¹ Mr. W. W. Hyde in his *Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art* writes (p. 67) "The doctrine of human proportions is very ancient, originating in Egyptian Art." From Mr. Jean Capart we learn (*cf. Egyptian Art*, p. 156) that the first canon employed by the Egyptians in the time of the Ancient Empire, 'divides an erect human figure over 18 squares, the highest of which ends, not at the top of the head, but at the top of the brow, thus leaving the dome of the skull outside, as well as the head-dresses or crowns which the Egyptian monuments display in such great variety. The knee falls over the 6th square, the upper part of the legs over the 9th, the shoulders over the 16th, the nose over the 17th. The head which occupies two squares, is thus $\frac{1}{9}$ th of the rest of the body. Under the same system, the sitting figure occupies 15 squares, *plus* the dome of the head,

of Varāhamihira's *Brhatsamhitā* (MM. S. Dvivedi's edition—Vizianagram Sanskrit Series) is extremely interesting; as in dealing with the various measurements of the different parts of images, the author refers to previous writers on the subject such as Nagnajit² and Vasiṣṭha. Bhaṭṭa Utpala, while commenting on his work, actually quotes from these writers, most of whose works have, up till now, been lost to us. Varāhamihira flourished in the middle of the 6th century A. D. or somewhat earlier; and the authors mentioned by him evidently wrote some time before that date. It is probable that iconological and other *śilpa* works in general were composed in the early centuries of the Christian era when there was a great impetus to image-making due to the systematic development of the doctrine of *bhakti*, the growth of sectarianism in religion and other causes.

Lepsius sought for the basis of these canons in the length of the foot, Wilkinson in the height of the foot; C. Blane claims to have discovered it in the length of the 'medius.' It will be of interest to note in this connection that the width of the middle digit of the medius was sometimes regarded as the unit of measurement by the Indian artists. Mr. Hyde very properly remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 68) that the greatest artists—architects, painters, and sculptors of all times have taught and practised the doctrine that certain proportions are beautiful, e.g., the proportion of the height of the head or the length of the foot to the whole body, or the length of the parts of the head or body to other parts. In modern times, we have only to mention such names as those of da Vinci, Duerer, Raphael and Flaxman. In Greek days there were many artists who formulated such canons of proportions. Greek sculptors followed ratios of proportions so closely that we have statues of various schools which are distinguished by fixed proportions of parts, such as the Old Attic, Old Argive, Polykleitan, Argive-Sikyonian or Lysippan, etc. Some of these schools used the foot as the common measure, while others used the palm, finger or other member. "An oft-quoted saying of Polyclitus is to this effect 'Successful attainment in art is the result of minute accuracy in a multitude of arithmetical proportions.....' Polyclitus not only published his theory of sculpture in a work called '*The Canon*,' but also having taught in that treatise all the proportions of the body, he carried his theory into practice by constructing a statue according to the prescriptions in the treatise, '*The Canon*'" (E. A. Gardner, *Six Greek Sculptors*, pp. 118 and 120).

² This author was at one time a recognised authority on Indian fine arts especially painting. He was regarded as one of the three art teachers, the other two being, Viśvakarmā and Prahlāda. Laufer, in his edition of *Citra-lakṣaṇa*, says that Nagnajit was an old artist who portrayed figures of gods and was probably regarded as an incarnation of Viśvakarman. In fact, as the same German author informs us, the first chapter of the treatise edited by him is designated as the *Citrakakṣaṇa* of Nagnajit (*Nagnajitcitrakakṣaṇa* or *Nagnavrata*).

But texts bearing iconometrical rules though apparently general in their application, that have so far been noticed and some edited by scholars,³ are mostly in connection with images of the Brāhmanical divinities. Information about the icons of various Buddhas, Buddhaśaktis and Bodhisattvas (both male and female) are collected in the *Sādhanamālā* of the Vajrayāna literature, mostly compiled in Tibet and Nepal. But those which have so far been edited are mostly iconographic in character⁴; very few of them, if any, contain any detailed reference to the various measurements of the different bodily parts of these Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. So, any text which deals with the iconometry of these types of images, is certainly of unique interest for the purpose of studying Buddhist iconography.

In the introduction to his edition of *Citralakṣaṇa*,⁵ Dr. Laufer refers to the fact that in Tanjur under the title 'the art of representation' (Darstellende Kunst) are included the following four works, viz., (1) *Daśatālanyagrodhaparimaṇḍala buddha-pratimālakṣaṇanāma*, (2) *Sambuddhabhāṣita pratimālakṣaṇa-vivaraṇanāma*, (3) *Citralakṣaṇam*, (4) *Pratimāmānalakṣaṇanāma*, all of which were translated into Tibetan from Sanskrit. He further remarks that the Sanskrit originals of these texts are in all probability lost to us. Mr. Phanindra Nath Bose, however, writes⁶ that among the manuscripts (Sanskrit ?) which were

³ For disquisitions on the measurements of Indian images mostly Brāhmanical in character), the reader is referred to, Hadaway, 'On Some Indian Śilpaśāstras, in *Ost-Asiatische Zeitschrift*, 1914; T. A. G. Rao, *Tālamāna or Iconometry*, *Mem. Arch. Surv. of India*, No. 3; Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. I, Part II, Appendix B.

⁴ M. A. Foucher, *Iconographie Bouddhique*. B. T. Bhattacharya, *Sādhanamālā*, Vols. I and II, Gakwar Oriental Series; *Buddhist Iconography*.

⁵ B. Laufer, *Das Citralakṣaṇa*. Introduction, pp. 1-2.

⁶ P. Bose, *Pratimāmānalakṣaṇam*, Introduction, p. ii. It is evident that due to an oversight, the author puts down here that he is editing the text of *Pratimālakṣaṇa*; he correctly designates the text in the other parts of his edition, as *Pratimāmāna-lakṣaṇam*. This text is, according to him, described in the Tibetan version in two ways viz., (1) *Pratimāmāna-lakṣaṇam* by the sage Ātreya, and (2) *Ātreya-tilaka*; while the Sanskrit original suggests three different names, viz., (i) *Devilakṣaṇam*, (ii) *Ātreyalakṣaṇam* and (iii) *Ātreya-tilaka* (P. Bose, *op. cit.*, Introduction, p. v). But, it may be observed here that *Devilakṣaṇam* can

presented to the Viśvabhāratī Library by the Nepal Durbar, were found the first three of the four mentioned above; he chose to edit *Pratimālakṣaṇaṁ* (*Pratimāmānalakṣaṇaṁ*) with its Tibetan version, promising at the same time that the two other Śilpa MSS. would also be edited by him in due course.

The text which is being edited here may not be exactly the same as the second in Laufer's list mentioned above. In its colophon, it is described as *SamyakSambuddhabhāṣita* [Buddha]-*Pratimālakṣaṇaṁ* whereas in the Tibetan list, the name is slightly different. There were evidently two manuscripts, one a commentary on the other, as we know from Dr. Cecil Bendall's *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts* (p. 200) in the Cambridge University. Nos. III and IV under Add. 1706 (about which Bendall remarks "A collection of palm-leaf fragments and volumes of works chiefly on ritual, the construction of images, etc.) in that *Catalogue*⁷ are described in their colophons as *SamyakSambuddhabhāṣitabuddhapratimālakṣaṇaṁ* and *Sambuddhabhāṣitapratimālakṣaṇāvivarana*, respectively. Dr. Bendall informs us that the latter is a commentary on the former. The Viśvabhāratī MSS. as referred to by Mr. P. Bose is probably another copy of the same commentary as is the case with that which found place in the *bsTangyur*. It may be noted, however, that there is no mention of this text either in Dr. R. L. Mitra's *Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal* or in MM. H. P. Sastri's *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Durbar Library of Nepal*. Another interesting point to be taken notice of in connection with this text is that it has been elaborately

on no account be described as standing for one of the names of this text; for it appears from another manuscript copy of the same text in the possession of Dr. P. C. Bagchi in this manner: *iti devīlakṣaṇaṁ aṣṭatālaṁ*, which can only mean that the devī icons are specified by eight tāla measurement; again, the section on *aṣṭatāla* in Mr. Bose's text contains this distinct reference to the *aṣṭatāla* measurement of the goddesses—*dirghaṁ cāṣṭamukhaṁ kuryāt devīnāṁ lakṣaṇaṁ budhaṁ* (88).

⁷ I am indebted to Dr. P. C. Bagchi for his drawing my attention to it. He has also kindly helped me with a copy of the pages of the unpublished text called *Kriyāsamuccaya*, in a section of which our text has been elaborately commented on.

commented on by the author of the treatise called *Kriyāsamuccaya*, an elaborate work on Buddhist rituals, in its pages 186b-189b (the work is unpublished).

A few more words about the general features of this short text will not be out of place here. It begins with a salutation to Buddha ; then partially imitating the manner of the much earlier Buddhist *sūtra* works, it introduces Buddha himself as the expounder of the details about his own image to his chief interlocutor, Śāriputra ; and the other characteristic feature of *sūtra* writings, viz., the words, *evam mayā śrutam*, in the beginning, though absent in our copy, is present in the Cambridge University original.⁸ No mention, however, is made either of the author or its date of composition. Another peculiarity of the earlier *sūtras* is imitated ; there are a few lines of prose in its beginning, by way of introducing the subject and then the *gāthā* portion of the text begins. There is some doubt as to the exact spot where the prose portion ends and verse commences ; but on a comparison with its Chinese translation, it appears that ‘*svenāṅguli-pramāṇena śataṁ vimśatyuttaram*’ is probably the first line of the latter. Again, many are the lines of the verse which do not find their place in the Chinese rendering ; it is very likely, if not certain, that these were interpolated in the body of the original text after it had been translated into Chinese. The portions which are not in Chinese are put inside brackets, in the body of the text. Grammatical mistakes and unintelligible terms are very few many of which can be explained as copyist’s mistakes. Thus, the term *salalitvatam* which is unintelligible in this context occurs in the 5th line of the prose portion ; similarly, the enigmatic term *kukunī* is found in the 25th couplet ; but both these have been satisfactorily emended with the help of another text called *Kriyāsamuccaya*, referred to

⁸ Dr. Bendall writes about it. “ A short treatise in two parts on images, probably more or less in imitation of Varāhamihira’s work (*Pratimālakṣaṇam*, Ch. 58 of *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*) just noticed. The work is in regular *sūtra* form, beginning : *Namaḥ sarvajñāya. Evam mayā śrutam...* ”


above, the correct words substituted being *salīlatvaṃ* (the commentator explains it by adding *tribhaṅgatvādi guṇena*) and *kaphoṇi* respectively. The couplet—*Etāni ca samastāni lakṣaṇāni vicakṣaṇaḥ | Atyantaśāntakūyārthaṃ yathasau(o)-bhaṃ prakalpayet*—which occurs in the end of the Cambridge University original, is absent in our copy. Five couplets, however, which have no definite and organic connection with the subject-matter of this text, though occurring in the end of our copy, have been given no place in the body of the text, edited here. Lastly, this small manuscript of about 50 verses not only deals with the rules of measurement to be adopted in making the Buddha figures, but also, in connection with the delineation of the general features of the images, incidentally refers to some of the more important beauty marks or characteristic signs⁹ which are always to be found, according to the canons, in a great man's person.

The problem of the date of composition of this text is very difficult to be solved. The fact that it or its commentary has been translated into Tibetan and Chinese¹⁰ definitely proves that it is not of a recent date. The collection of palm-leaf fragments and volumes of works chiefly on ritual, the construction of images, etc., described by Bendall in his catalogue (referred to above) has only one amongst them, *Khaḍgapujāvidhi* by name, which has got the date 381 N.S. (1261 A.D.) in its colophon. From the similarity of the characters in which *Sambuddha-bhāṣita-pratimālakṣaṇa* was written with those of the above-mentioned dated work, Bendall fixed the age of the former in the 13th century A.D. There is no doubt about that being its later limit; but that does not preclude the suggestion that the work might have been composed a few centuries earlier. It is

⁹ *Mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇāni* : These are 32 main ones ; while 80 minor ones (*aśītyannu-
vyañjanāni*) are also mentioned. A full list of these are given in Buddhist canonical work,
both early and late,—the early ones being usually silent about the 80 minor ones.

¹⁰ Dr. Bagchi informs me that it was rendered into Chinese from its Tibetan version.

very likely that the work was originally composed by some pious Buddhist *śilpācārya* in Eastern India and later it found its way to the adjoining country of Nepal. Some definite internal evidences which are to be discussed in our notes also tend to the conclusion that the work was composed some considerable time earlier than the 13th century A.D.



TEXT AND ENGLISH TRANSLATION

ओं नमो बुद्धाय ॥ बुद्धोभगवाञ्चेतवने विहरति स्म । तुषितवरभवनाच्चातु-
 र्धर्मदेशनादागतकालसमये शारिपुत्रो भगवन्तमेतदवोचत् ॥ भगवन् भगवति गते¹
 परिनिर्वृते वा श्राद्धैः कुलपुत्रैः कथं प्रतिपत्तव्यं । भगवानाह ॥ शारिपुत्र मयि
 गते परिनिर्वृते वा न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलं कायं कर्तव्यं । यावत्कायं तावदुत्थामं ।
 यावदुत्थामं तावत्कायं ॥ पूजासत्कारार्थम्यतिमा कर्तव्या । सर्वाङ्गोपाङ्गावयवस्थौल्य-
 लावण्य-सलीलत्वम्² ॥ कृत्वाकारं³ शिरस्कन्धं संस्थितोष्णीषेत्वादिसुसंस्थानात् ।
 तत्राऽऽयामविस्तारोच्छेद सन्धिवन्धनिर्गमैः ॥ [प्रमाणं बोधिसत्त्वानाम् सुगतानाञ्च
 प्रवक्ष्यामि तच्छृणु । तत्र तावत्प्रमाणं बोधिसत्त्वानां ।]

Om, Salutation to Buddha.

Buddha, the Holy One was staying (then) in the Jeta-
 vana. When he had come back from the noble Tuṣita heaven
 after initiating his mother into the *dharma*, Śāriputra said to the
 Worshipful One, "Oh Lord! When you go (else where) or attain
parinirvāṇa, how will you be honoured by the noble and respec-
 table disciples (of yours). The Master replied 'Oh Śāriputra!
 When I go (elsewhere) or attain *parinirvāṇa*, my body (image)
 of *nyagrodhaparimanṭala* (for explanation see note) type should
 be made; (i. e.) the full height of the figure should be equal to
 its width across the chest along the line of the arms fully out-
 stretched. The image should be made for worship and reverence;
 and it should have all its main and subordinate limbs (marked by
 proportionate) stoutness, loveliness, beauty and grace. Its head

1 Our copy has भगवता गते. भगवता विना is in the Cambridge MSS.

2 सलीलत्वम् विभङ्गत्वादिगुणेन (from *Kriyāsamuccaya*). सललीलत्वम् in our copy.

3 In the *Kriyāsamuccaya*, just before कृत्वाकार occurs सप्तोत्सेधः commented on in the
 following manner. सप्तोत्सेधेति सप्तावयवाः उत्सेधाः उच्छ्रया उन्नतायेति ... कतमे पदद्वयं इसद्वयं
 स्तम्भद्वयं यौवाचेति...किञ्चिदुन्नतिरुच्छेधः । *Sattussaddo* is one of the 32 great man's signs in Pāli
 Texts.

स्वेनाङ्गलिप्रमाणेन शतम् विंशत्युत्तरं ।

[बुद्धानां पञ्चविंशत्युत्तरं]

चतुरङ्गलमुष्णीषं केशस्थानन्ततोदयं ॥१॥

सार्धत्रयोदशो मात्रा मुखभागश्च तत्रयं ।

ललाटं नासिकाश्चाधं चिबुकान्तं तृतीयकं ॥२॥

चतुरङ्गलं ललाटन्तु तुल्यं नासिकया भवेत्⁴ ।

साधिकं चिबुकान्तन्तु चिबुकं द्व्यङ्गलं भवेत् ॥३॥

and shoulders should be like an umbrella (*i.e.*, rounded like it at the top) and *Uṣṇīṣa* and other things should also be well-placed (on its head). It should be of (proportionate) length, breadth and thickness and (should bear) joints, sinews or tendons (*bandha*) and orifices (*nirgama*). [Now, listen to what I say about the (height) measurement of (the figures of) the Bodhisattvas and Sugatas ; thus the height of the former should measure 120 times its own *āṅgula*, while that of the latter 125 times the same.]

(The measurement of the Buddha images) should be 120 times its own *āṅgula* ; the *uṣṇīṣa* (the protuberance on the skull) should be 4 *āṅgulas* and the scalp, twice the same (1). The face should be $13\frac{1}{2}$ *āṅgulas* and it should be divided into 3 parts, *viz.*, the forehead, the portion beneath it up to the bottom of the nose, and thence to the end of the chin (2). The forehead, like the nose, should be 4 *āṅgulas* ; the portion below the nose up to the end of the chin should be a little ($\frac{1}{2}$ *āṅgula* acc. to the Chinese version and $1\frac{1}{2}$ according to the Sanskrit text) in excess ; and the chin should be 2 *āṅgulas* (3). The length (here height) of the chin from the orifice (of the mouth) is said to be 4 *āṅgulas* ; the two temples, extending from the root of the ears

⁴ ललाटनासिकाधचिबुकान्तं चतुर्धाधिकचतुरङ्गलं एतेनाईवयोदशमात्रामुखभागः. This Kr. S. commentary seems to give us here the correct interpretation ; the copy is a bit faulty, here. Four *yavas* are equal to half an *āṅgula* and so, if each of the three divisions of the face be $4\frac{1}{2}$ *an.* then the total becomes $13\frac{1}{2}$ *an.*

आयामम् निर्गमाच्चैव चतुरङ्गलमिष्यते ।
 चतुरङ्गली कपोली तु कर्णमूलाद्विनिःसृतौ ॥४॥
 हनुः स्याच्चतुरङ्गलोच्छेदोविस्तारे द्वाङ्गुलश्च सः ।
 साधिकः परिपूर्णः स्यान्महासिंहहनुर्यथा ॥५॥
 अधरो द्वाङ्गुलायामो निर्गमोच्छेदमात्रिकः ।
 मध्ये स्याच्छोभना रेखा सृक्कणी ^५ मात्रिके स्मृतौ ॥६॥
 चतुरङ्गलमायामं वक्त्रं कुर्याद्विचक्षणः ।
 यथोपपन्नस्थानाञ्चत्वारिंशद्दशनाः स्मृताः ॥७॥
 [उत्तरोष्ठोङ्गुलार्धः स्यात्तथैवोच्छेदनिर्गमः ।]
 त्रिभागाङ्गलिका कार्या गोजी तस्योपरि स्थिता ॥८॥

should be 4 *āṅgulas* each (4). The jaw (*hanu*) should be 3 *āṅgulas* in its thickness (? height or length) and 2 in its breadth ; it should be full (fleshy) and a little in excess (?) as the jaws of the great lion (5). The lower lip is to be 2 *āṅgulas* in length, while the orifice (of the mouth), 1 *mātrā* (i.e., an *āṅgula*) in height ; and there should be a beautiful line in the middle, and the sides of the mouth (*srkkaṇī*) should measure 1 *mātrā* (6). The wise should make the mouth 4 *āṅgulas* in length ; and forty teeth are known to be attached to their proper places (in the gum) (7). [The upper lip should be $\frac{1}{2}$ an *āṅgula*, while its height and *nirgama* (the meaning of 'orifice' does not fit in here ; may it mean *upamāna*, which is another of its meaning ? But that also will not explain the line here) should also be the same] ; the *gojī* (the short vertical dimple between the centre of the upper lip and the nasal septum) placed above it should be made (to measure) 3 parts of an *āṅgula* (8). The nose (at its base) is to be 2 *āṅgulas* in width and $1\frac{1}{2}$ *āṅgulas* high ; and the circular orifices (*śrotasī*) of the nose are known (to measure),

⁵ शृङ्गला, in our copy, is meaningless. सृक्कणी is in the Kr. S. commentary which lays down एकाङ्गुली सृक्कणी ।

नासा इष्टलविस्तारा सार्द्धमङ्गलमुन्नता ।
 अर्द्धाङ्गले समे वृत्ते नासायाः श्रोतसी स्मृते ॥८॥
 नासावंशः समो मध्ये विस्तारेणार्द्धमात्रिकः ।
 नेत्रान्तरेऽङ्गुलो ज्ञेयो नेत्रे च चतुरङ्गुले ॥९॥
 १[विस्तारो इष्टलं मध्ये] तयोस्तारा त्रिभागिकी ।
 दृष्टिः स्यात्पञ्चभागेन [इष्टलं त्र्यङ्गलं तयोः] ॥१०॥
 अङ्गुलस्य चतुर्थ्यांशो विस्तृतोऽक्षिसमुन्नतः ।
 पद्मपत्राकृतिं कार्यं नेत्रकोशोऽङ्गलितयं ॥११॥
 [करवीरसमं सूत्रं नेत्रयोर्नासिकापुटे ।
 तारासमे च चिबुके सृक्कणी परियोजयेत् ॥१२॥]

$\frac{1}{2}$ an *āṅgula* (9). The nasal septum between the two is to be $\frac{1}{2}$ a *mātrā* in its width; and (the space) between the two eyes is known as 1 *āṅgula* and the eyes 4 *āṅgulas* (10). (The eyes) should be 2 *āṅgulas* in width in the middle, and the pupils thereof, 3 parts (of an *āṅgula*); the eyesight (*dr̥ṣṭi*?) should be 5 parts, 2 and 3 *āṅgulas* of the same (the meaning of this line is not at all clear; in Chinese, in place of this obscure line, it is simply laid down that 'the pupil is right in the centre of the eye') (11). The globular ball (*samudgaka*) of the eye is $\frac{1}{4}$ of an *āṅgula* wide; the sockets of the eyes (measuring) 3 *āṅgulas* (each) should be made in the shape of a lotus leaf (12). The wings of the nose should be in the same line with the *kara-vīra* (? the red flesh in the near-side corner) of the eyes; and the two lateral ends of the mouth should be placed in the same line with the pupils and the (two lateral ends of the) chin (13). The intermediate space between the two eye-brows should be made $1\frac{1}{2}$ *āṅgulas* wide; and it should be known (that there is) an

6 The *Kriyāsamuccaya* here refers to 3 types of measurement of the eyes of 3 types of divinities, thus : क्रोधानां कुटिला बुद्धानां ध्यानदृष्टीनां त्रियवविस्ताराद् इष्टलं यदावधिकायामाष्टापाकान् बोधिसत्त्वानां चतुर्थवविस्तारात् विंशतियवायामात् उत्पलं सर्वासां भङ्गरस्त्रीनां अष्टादशयवायामि त्रियव-विस्तारान्मत्स्योदराकारं ।

अन्तरन्तु भ्रुवः कार्यं विस्तृतं सार्द्धमङ्गुलं ।
 मध्ये चोर्णावविज्ञेया शुभा पूर्णैन्दुसन्निभा ॥१४॥
 [नासिकासमसूत्रोर्णा तथा मूर्धजसंस्थितः ।
 शिरोमणिः सविज्ञेयः सुप्रभो विमलस्तथा ॥१५॥
 चतुरङ्गलमुच्छेदात्तलाटोपरिमस्तकं ।
 कृत्राकारं शुभं नीलं दक्षिणावर्तमूर्धजम् ॥१६॥
 भ्रूरेखा स्याच्चतुर्मात्रा [कर्णाग्रं चापि तत्समम्] ।
 निःसृतौ द्वाङ्गुली कर्णौ तयोः पदार्द्धमात्रिकः ॥१७॥
 उच्छेदो मात्रिको ज्ञेयः श्लिष्टः श्रोऽत्रोर्द्धमात्रिकः ⁷ ।
 अङ्गुलस्य चतुर्थांशः कर्णावर्तसु ⁸ विस्तरः ॥१८॥
 सार्द्धमात्रेऽङ्गुली द्वे स्यात्कर्णस्वन्तरभागतः ।
 पाश्र्वौ स्यातां यथाशोभं केशाश्चापि तथैव च ॥१९॥

urnā, auspicious and shining like a full moon, in the middle (14). The *urnā* should be in the same line with the nose ; then, the crest jewel (? *śiromaṇi*) placed among the hair should be known as lustrous and spotless (15). The auspicious, umbrella-shaped head of blue colour, with the hair all turning towards the right, is above the forehead and 4 *aṅgulas* in height (16). The line of the brow should be 4 *mātrās* and the upper portion (or outer side ?) of the ear, also the same ; the ear (should be) 2 *aṅgulas* extended outside (*niḥsṛtau*?) and their leaves are $\frac{1}{2}$ a *mātrā* (17). (Their) height should be known as 1 *mātrā* and the upper leaves of the ears should be $\frac{1}{2}$ a *mātrā* ; and the space between the temple and the earholes, $\frac{1}{4}$ of an *aṅgulā* in extent (18). The ear in its inner side should measure 2 *aṅgulas* by $1\frac{1}{2}$ *mātrās* ; locks of hair should likewise be appropriately (shown) on its side (19). The lobe of the ear (should be) $5\frac{1}{2}$ *mātrās* in length.

⁷ श्लिष्टश्रोत्र is not clear. The *Kr. Sam.* MSS. puts here तयोरुर्द्धपदं चतुर्थैव । So, the reading may be उर्द्धपदोर्द्धमात्रिकः, meaning that the upper leaf of the ear should be $\frac{1}{2}$ a *mātrā*.

⁸ The *Kr. Sam.* MSS. explains कर्णावर्तः thus :—कपोलकर्णद्वयोर्भागे कर्णावर्तः कलिकाकारो द्विवहः ।

अर्द्धपञ्चममात्रञ्च कर्णलता तु दीर्घतः^९ ।

कर्णात्कर्णान्तोविज्ञेयो मस्तकोऽष्टादशाङ्गुलः ॥२०॥

चतुर्दशाङ्गुलं पृष्ठं तयोरन्तरमिष्यते ।

चत्वारिंशन्मात्रकञ्च शिरः स्यात्परिणाहतः ॥२१॥

ग्रीवोच्छेदाच्चतुर्मात्रा विस्तारादष्टमात्रिका ।

परिणाहाच्च कर्तव्या चतुर्विंशतिमात्रिका ॥२२॥

ग्रीवान्तान्यङ्गुलान्यष्टौ स्कन्धांसो द्वादशाङ्गुलः ।

[चितान्तरांसो वृत्तश्च स्कन्ध ! स्यात्तत्पर्याप्तः ॥२३॥]

चत्वारिंशन्मात्राणि बाहौ चायाममिष्यते ।

बाहुर्विंशतिमात्रसु प्रबाहुः षोडशस्तथा ॥२४॥

(In Chinese, the measurements of the different sections of the ear are thus put down; the ear-hole $\frac{1}{2}$ an *āṅgula*; hanging branch 4 *āṅgulas*; the largeness section, i.e., the width, 2; inside the ear, up and down, $\frac{1}{4}$; the depth of the connecting canal, $2\frac{1}{2}$; the leaf of the ear, $4\frac{1}{2}$; the end of the ear, 5.) The head, from one ear to the end of the other (should be) 18 *āṅgulas* (20). The back (of the head) between them (the ears) is known as 14 *āṅgulas*; the periphery of the head, however, should be 40 *mātrās* (21). The neck is to be 4 *mātrās* high and 8 *mātrās* wide; while its circumference should be made 24 *mātrās* (22). The two ends of the neck are to be 8 *āṅgulas* and the shoulder (*skandhāmsa*; *skandha* and *amsa* mean the same thing; are both used here for the sake of the metre ?) 12 *āṅgulas* (In Chinese, it is put in this manner: the ends of the neck reach up to the points of the shoulders which measure equally 12 *āṅgulas*); there is no furrow between its shoulders which should be endowed with auspicious marks (23). The length of the two arms is known to be 40 *mātrās*; (of which) the upper arm is to measure 20, and the forearm 16 (24). The palm (or hand proper—*hastāgra*) from the wrist is said to be 12 *āṅgulas* (in length); while, the elbows

⁹ The reading in our copy, कर्णपञ्चमयाङ्गुलतः is not clear. The *Kr. Sam.* tells us that the कर्णलता, i.e. the ear-lobe is 4 *an.* long (कर्णलता चतुरङ्गुली दीर्घतः).

[द्वादशाङ्गलहस्तायं मणिबन्धाग्रकीर्तितम् ।
 कफोष्णीमणिबन्धयोरायाममङ्गलं स्मृतम् ¹⁰ ॥२५॥
 बाहोर्मध्यपरिक्षेप कार्यो विंशतिमात्रिकः ।
 प्रबाहुः षोडशांशः स्याद्विषट्को मणिबन्धने ॥२६॥
 आयामं सप्तमं पाणौ तलविस्तारपञ्चकं ।
 शङ्खं चक्रं तले न्यस्तं पद्मं च कुलिशाङ्कुशम् ॥
 [संलक्षणरूपिण्यो लेखाः कार्याः पृथग्विधाः॥]२७॥
 पञ्चाङ्गलायता मध्या पर्वाङ्गोना प्रदेशिनी ।
 अङ्गुलार्धविहीना तु कर्तव्या स्यादनामिका ॥२८॥
 अनामिकातः पर्वाङ्गोना कर्तव्या तु कनीयसो ।
 त्रिपर्वाङ्गुलयः सर्वाः पर्वाङ्गेन नखाः शुभाः ॥२९॥
 मणिबन्धोपरिष्ठात्तु सोऽङ्गुष्ठश्चतुरङ्गुलः ।
 [तावानेव परिक्षेपः पर्वाङ्गेन नखश्च सः ॥३०॥]

and the wrists are to be known 1 *āṅgula* each in length (25). The circumference of the middle of the arm is 20 *mātrās* ; that of the forearm should be 16 such parts and that of the wrist, twice 6, *i.e.*, 12 *āṅgulas* (26). The palm of the hand (excluding the fingers) is to be 7 *āṅgulas* in length and 5 in breadth ; conch-shell, discus, lotus, thunderbolt and elephant goad should be placed (*i.e.*, carved or marked) on the palm and different other auspicious and beautiful signs should be made (*i.e.*, drawn on the palm) (27). The medius is 5 *āṅgulas* in length ; the index finger is less by half a digit (*parva*) ; and the ring finger should also be made less by $\frac{1}{2}$ an *āṅgula* (*i.e.*, $4\frac{1}{2}$ *an.*) (28). The little finger should be made less than the ring finger by 1 digit ; all the fingers have 3 digits and the auspicious nails should be $\frac{1}{2}$ a digit (in each case) (29). The (distance) of the thumb above the wrist is 4 *āṅgulas* ; the periphery of the thumb (whose length is 4 *an.*) is also the same ; its nail is $\frac{1}{2}$ a *parva* (30). The

¹⁰ The reading in our copy कृत्स्नीमणिबन्धाग्रकीर्तितम् लक्षाङ्गलं स्मृतम् is evidently wrong. The *Kr. Sam.* commentary helps us to correct it as above.

अङ्गुष्ठात्तु प्रदेशिन्या अन्तरं त्र्यङ्गुलं स्मृतं ।
 कनोयसो मणिधन्वाद्भवेत्पञ्चाङ्गुलायता ॥३१॥
 अग्रहस्तपरिक्षिपो विज्ञेयो द्वादशाङ्गुलः ।
 दैर्घ्यात्तृतीयभागः स्यात्स्वाङ्गुलीनां परिग्रहः ॥३२॥
 ग्रीवाहृदययोर्मध्ये सार्द्धद्वादशमात्रिकः ।
 हृन्नाभ्योश्च तथा चैव स्तनयोरपि चान्तरम् ॥३३॥
 स्तनयोरपरिष्ठाच्च कक्षे कार्यं षडङ्गुले ।
 तदूर्ध्वं पुनरास्कन्धं नवमात्रा प्रकीर्तिता ॥३४॥
 उरसोऽपि च विस्तारः पञ्चविंशतिमात्रिकः ।
 परिणाहादुरः कार्यं विस्तारात्त्रिगुणं शुभं ॥३५॥
 स्तननाभ्यन्तरे चैव षोडशाङ्गुलमिष्यते ।
 अवेधः सन्धिरन्ध्राभ्यां नाभिमण्डलमङ्गुलम् ॥३६॥
 नाभिमध्यात्परिक्षिपः षट्चत्वारिंशदङ्गुलः ।
 अष्टादशाङ्गुलं चैव विस्तारेण कटिर्भवेत् ॥३७॥

distance of the index finger from the thumb is known as 3 *angulas* ; (while) the (space) between the wrist and the ring finger (should measure) 5 *angulas* in length (31). The circumference of the fore-part of the hand (of the middle of the palm ?) should be known as 12 *angulas* ; while the same of its own fingers should be three parts (? or really $\frac{1}{3}$) of its length (32). The (distance) between the neck and the chest will be $12\frac{1}{2}$ *mātrās* ; the distance between the two breasts as well as that between the chest and the navel (should be) the same (33). The two arm-pits should be made 6 *angulas* above the breasts; again, the height from that (? armpit) up to the shoulders is declared to be 9 *mātrās* (34). The width of the chest is 25 *mātrās* ; (while) its circumference should be made 3 times its width and be auspicious (35). The distance between the breasts and the navel is known to be 16 *angulas* ; the 1 *angula* (deep) navel should be unintersected by joints and holes (?) (36). The circumference (of the trunk) round the middle of the navel, is 46 *angulas* ; (while) the waist is to be 18 *angulas* in its width (37). The

नाभिमेद्रान्तरञ्च स्यात्सार्द्धद्वादशमात्रिकः ।
 तदर्धेन तु मेद्रः स्यादायामपरिणाहतः ॥३८॥
 पञ्चमात्राऽऽयतौ लम्बौ वृषणौ चतुरङ्गुली ।
 पञ्चमात्राणि चत्वारि विस्ताराऽऽयामतस्तयोः ॥३९॥
 ऊरु समाहितौ कार्यौ पञ्चविंशतिमात्रिकौ ।
 [सुविस्तारं तयोर्मध्यं मापयेद्द्वादशाङ्गुलम् ॥४०॥]
 परिणाहोऽपि कर्तव्यं शुभं षट्त्रिंशदङ्गुलम् ।
 (?)अष्टाविंशत्यङ्गुलञ्च मध्यवेष्टनं जानुतः ¹¹ ॥४१॥
 सन्धिवन्धस्तुर्मात्रा त्रिद्विकं जानुगुल्फकं ।
 [गूढगुल्फशिरास्थित्वं सुकुमारौ तलौ शुभौ ॥४२॥]

distance of the penis from the navel should be $12\frac{1}{2}$ *mātrās* ; the penis should be half that (size) in its length and circumference (35). The testicles should be 5 *mātrās* in width and 4 in length (39). The joined thighs should be made 25 *mātrās* ; the full width of the middle of these two should be measured 12 *āṅgulas* (40). Their circumference (in the middle) too should auspiciously measure 36 *āṅgulas* (in Chinese 32) ; the circumference of the middle of the knee is 28 *āṅgulas* (41). The *sandhibandha* is 4 *mātrās* and the knee-cap and heel are 3 and 2 (*āṅgulas*) respectively ; the heel, veins and bones being hidden, the feet are handsome and auspicious (42). The forelegs should be straight and tapering and 25 *mātrās* in length ; the circumference of the middle of these two, should measure 21 *mātrās*

¹¹ In our copy, this line is incomplete ; it is : मध्ये चतुरङ्गुलम् ... जानुतः. Our emended reading is based on the Chinese rendering as well as on the *Kr. S.* commentary. The Chinese version tells us that the circumference of the knee is 28 *āṅgulas*. The *Kriyāsamuccaya* lays down here ऊरुमध्यवेष्टनेन द्वाविंशदङ्गुलं जानुवेष्टनमष्टाविंशत्यङ्गुलं. It may be observed here, that our copy differs from the *Kriyāsamuccaya* as well as the Chinese version regarding the measurement of the circumference in the middle of the thighs ; the former says it should be 36, while both the latter lay down 32,

ऋजुवृत्तायते जङ्घे पञ्चविंशतिमात्रिके ।
 तयोर्मध्ये परिणाह एकविंशतिमात्रिकः ¹² ॥४३॥
 चतुर्दशाङ्गुलाऽऽयता गुल्फान्ताश्चतुरङ्गुलम् ।
 गुल्फाद्द्विदशकायामः पादः पादार्धविस्तरः ॥४४॥
 पाखौ द्व्यङ्गुलविस्तारौ पाष्णी च चतुरङ्गुले ।
 [षडङ्गुलं सुविस्तरं त्रिगुणं परिणाहतः ¹³ ॥४५॥]
 पञ्चाङ्गुल्योऽपिपर्वाणि पर्वाङ्गेन नखाः स्मृताः ।
 पञ्चाङ्गुलं परिच्छेपादङ्गुलस्रष्ट्रङ्गुलायतः ॥४६॥
 अङ्गुलकसमा चैव सायामेन प्रदेशिनी ।
 षोडशाष्टाष्टभागेन शेषाः हीनाः परस्परम् ॥४७॥
 अङ्गुल्यो मात्रिकोच्छेदादङ्गुलः सार्द्धमात्रिकः ।
 तत्र ताम्रनखाः सर्वा अङ्गुल्यः कोमलायताः ॥४८॥

(43). The end of the heels is 4 *angulas*; the length of the feet from the heel is 12 (*angulas*) and their width is half (that of their length, i.e., 6 *an.*) (44). (In Chinese, the measurements of these parts of the legs are given thus :—the width from the ends of the *gulpha* 2 *an.* ? and down 4 *an.* ; the distance between the convexes is 3 *an.* ; the base of the foot 10 *an.* ; the thick portion 2 *an.* The side (of the feet) is 2 *angulas* in width and the back of the feet (*pārṣṇī*) is also 4 *angulas*, its full width is 6 *angulas* and is 3 times this in its circumference (45). The five toes (consist of) two digits, and the toe-nails are known to be $\frac{1}{2}$ a digit each ; the diameter (? outside measurement of all the 5 toes taken together) is 5 *angulas* and the big toe is 3 *angulas* in length (46). The second toe is equal to the big toe in its length ; and each succeeding toe is less by 16, 8 and 8 parts from its immediately preceding one (47). The height of the toes is 1 *mātrā*, while that of the big toe is $1\frac{1}{2}$ *mātrās* ; all these

¹² It is different in *Kriyāsamuccaya* which gives us 2 measurements, thus ;
 जंघामध्यवेष्टनं चतुर्विंशत्यङ्गुलं जंघाधोवेष्टनमेकविंशत्यङ्गुलं.

¹³ This line is explained in *Kr. S.* thus : पादयन्त्रेणः पाष्णी चतुरङ्गुले अथचतुर्दशः षडङ्गुले
 तिर्यक्विस्ताराश्च परिणाहिनाष्टादशाङ्गुले.

कूर्मपृष्ठसमौ पूर्णौ पादौ वह्निरलङ्कृतौ ।

समस्त्रिष्टोत्रताच्छिद्रौः सुप्रतिष्ठितलक्षणैः ।


तयोस्तलं सुचक्रादि चित्राकारन्तु कारयेत् ¹⁶॥४८॥

इति सम्यक् संबुद्धभाषितं प्रतिमालक्षणं समाप्तं ॥

toes bear copper-coloured nails and are tapering (? *komalāyatā*) (48). The two feet are full (*i.e.*, raised or convex) like the back of the tortoise ; and according to the (canons) of signs (? 32 signs of great men), (the feet) should be well-planted, joined (to the ground) and though raised, will not have any interstice (between them and the ground); the soles thereof should be made of beautiful shape and bear on them wheel and other (auspicious marks) (49).

Thus ends the *Pratimā-lakṣaṇa* as expounded by the Supreme Buddha.

¹⁶ Just after couplet No. 49, our copy has the following verses before it ends :—
पादाधूतं प्रशंसन्ति सर्वज्ञा इतकिल्बिषाः ॥ कुक्कुटाण्डान्तिलाकारं चतुरस्रं सुवर्तुलं ॥ सर्वसामान्यलिङ्गानां
सुखमेतच्चतुर्विधं ॥ महानरसुरस्त्रीणां कुक्कुटाण्डान्तिलाकृतिः । लावण्यं दर्शनीयं तत्कारयेत्तन्मुखद्वयं ॥
प्रेतभूतपिशाचानां रक्षसां विक्कताकृतिः । मण्डलं चतुरस्रं च कारयेत्तन्मुखद्वयं ॥ समा दृष्टिः प्रसन्ना च बुद्धानामव-
लोकने । नाघीनोर्ध्वं न दैन्येन संयुक्तां सर्वदर्शिना ॥ Some sort of commentary also occurs on these
lines in *Kriyāsamuccaya* in the following : कुक्कुटाण्डान्तिलाकारं चतुरस्रं मण्डलं सर्वसामान्यलिङ्गानाम्
सुखाकृतिः चतुर्विधा संबुद्धानां महावज्रधराणाञ्च सुखं कुक्कुटाण्डाकारं लोचनादिदेवकन्यानां तिलविलम्बाकारं
मैत्रेयादिमहाबोधिसत्त्वानां महावज्रधरवत् सुखं खर्वलम्बोदरक्रीधानां मण्डलाकारं हस्तमुखं ललितक्रीधानां
तु बोधिसत्त्ववत् प्रेतादीनां तु चतुरस्रमुखं लावण्यदर्शनं सुखद्वयं चतुरस्रं मण्डलं सुखद्वयं विक्कताकारं
समादृष्टिः प्रसन्नास्ते सोम्यनिष्ठावलोकने नोर्ध्वं नन्देत्ययुक्तेऽपि कर्तव्ये सर्वदर्शिनामिति । These lines as
well as many more following them, in *Kriyāsamuccaya*, prove that the couplets left out in
our edition formed part of another comprehensive treatise dealing with various other types
of images ; somehow, they came to be incorporated by the copyists in this text on Buddha
images only. I have not included these lines in this edition as they seem to have no organic
connection with our text.



NOTES.

तुषितवरभवना.....समये—

The reading in the original was मातुङ्गानादशनावगत, etc. Evidently that was a copyist's mistake. Our substitution मातुर्धर्मदेशनादागत helps us to extract some meaning out of the otherwise unmeaning passage. Apparently, the text here means that the Master was questioned by Śāriputra when the former had come back from the Tuṣita heaven after his mission of preaching the principles of Dharma to his mother there had successfully ended ; he was staying then in the Jetavana at Śrāvastī with his pupils. The form धर्मदेशना is very old and frequently occurs in Pali Buddhist literature ; cf. *Vinaya*, I. 16 ; *Dīgha Nikāya*, I. 110. But we have not been able to ascertain the significance of using both काल and समय ; it is very likely that there is something wrong here in this copy.

न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलं...तावत्कायं—

Nyagrodhaparimaṇḍala kāya is the 20th one of the 32 signs of great men (द्वात्रिंशन्महापुरुषलक्षणानि) in the list given in *Mahāvīyutpatti*. These signs are also mentioned in earlier works like *Mahāpadānasuttāntā*, *Lakkhaṇa Suttanta Lalitavistara*, *Dharma-pradīpikā*, etc. The author of our text here renders the whole of this passage in Sanskrit which we meet with in Prakrit in earlier literature ; thus, in the *Mahāpadāna suttānta*, it occurs *Ayam hi devakumāro nigrodha-parimaṇḍalo, yāvatakvassa kāyo tāvatakvassa vyāmo, yavatakvassa vyāmo tāvatakvassa kāyo*. (Rhys Davids, *The Dīgha Nikāya*, Vol. II, p. 18.) Dr. Rhys Davids translates this passage thus : “ His proportions have the symmetry of the banyan tree (literally, the banyan circumference ; it was believed that a banyan always measured the same, like

the diameter of a circle, in height as in width) :—The length of his body is equal to the compass of his arms, and the compass of his arms is equal to his height" (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, Part II, p. 15). Prof. Grünwedel's rendering of the term as 'his figure is like that of the banyan tree' (*Buddhist Art*, p. 161) is a bit obscure. We can quote several passages from comparatively early Sanskrit texts where this characteristic sign of a great man is referred to. Thus Sitā when describing her husband Rāma before Rāvana while the latter was about to abduct her in the forest of *Pañcavati*, says: सर्वलक्षणसम्पन्नम् न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलं । सत्यसन्धं महाभागमहं राममनुव्रता ॥ ३३ ॥ (*Rāmāyaṇa*, Aranyakāṇḍa, 47.33). The following passage from *Matsya-purāṇa*, Ch. 118, quoted in *Sabdakalpadrūma* about *nyagrodha-parimandala* is interesting, for it also correctly explains the significance of this peculiar term :—

महाधनुर्धराश्चैव त्रेतायां चक्रवर्तिनः ।
 सर्वलक्षणसम्पन्ना न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलाः ॥
 न्यग्रोधी तु स्मृतौ बाह्व्यामी न्यग्रोध उच्यते ।
 व्यामेन उच्छ्रयो यस्य अध ऊर्ध्वं च देहिनः ।
 समोच्छ्रयो परीणाहो न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलः ॥

Bhaṭṭa Utpala while commenting on verse 7 of Ch. 68 of *Bṛhatsamhitā* (this chapter deals with *Pañcamānuṣya-vibhāga*) quotes the following verse from Parāśara :

उच्छ्रायः परिणाहस्तु यस्य तुल्यं शरीरिणः ।
 स नरः पार्थिवो ज्ञेयो न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलः ॥

This verse is further explained by Utpala while commenting on the first line of verse 7 referred to above (the line runs thus :—षष्ठवतिरङ्गुलानाम् व्यायामो दीर्घता च हंसस्य ।) in this manner : हंसस्य षष्ठवतिरङ्गुलानाम् व्यायामः पृथुता च भवति । प्रसारितसुजडयस्य प्रमाणमित्यर्थः । दीर्घता चौच्चम् षष्ठवतिरङ्गुलानामेव ॥ Thus it appears from all this that this term lays special stress

on the unusual length of the arms (cf. the 18th one of the 32 great sigrs :—*Sthitānavanatapralambabāhutva—Mahāvyutpatti; thitako va cnonamanto ubhohi pāṇi-talehi jannukāni parimasati parimajjati—Mahapadānaṣuttānta*) and the width of the chest. Prof. Grütwedel remarks thus on this characteristic feature of the long arms : “The long arms are specially strange. With the Hindus as with the Persians, this is an old mark of noble birth. In old Persian names and cognomens, with which the Indian may be compared, this peculiarity is manifested ; I need only recall ‘Longimanus’ which corresponds to an old Persian epithet Darghabāzu, Old Indian Dīrghabāhu, and to the Persian name translated by the Greeks—Megabazos, Old Indian Mahabāhu, etc.” (*Bud. Art*, p. 162.) Might this simian characteristic be in some way or other connected with some of the human ancestral traits ? It will be of interest, in this connection, to refer to the special significance of this characteristic sign न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डल in its application to the female body ; for this, the verse quoted in *Sabdakalpadruma* from *Sābdamālā* will be helpful :

स्तनौ मुकुटिनी यस्या नितम्बे च विशालता ।

मध्ये क्षीणा भवेद् या सा न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डला ॥

In the light of this late verse which might be reminiscent of much earlier tradition about the ideas of female beauty, the very early free standing statues like the Besnagar and Didārganj *yakṣiṇīs* or such relievo figures as those of *Sīrīmā devatā* and other *yakṣiṇīs* and *devatās* of Bharhut and the *Vṛkṣakās* of Sānci and the female figures of Amarāvati, can be regarded as representing this type of feminine grace.

Hardy explains the term *Nyagrodhaparimaṇḍala* thus : “His body was high, like a banyan tree, and round like the same tree, i.e., the breadth was proportioned to the height” (*Manual of Buddhism*, p. 369). Dr. R. L. Mitra’s interpretation of this *lakṣaṇa* is correct. He writes : “The body of Prince Sarvārtha-siddha is as long as his fathom” (*Lalitavistara*, Translation,

Bibliotheca Indica, p. 143). His note on it (*ibid*, p. 170), is also interesting : "The Sanskrit *nyagrodha*, which means both a fathom and the banyan tree, has been taken in the latter sense by the Chinese translator. A perfect human figure measures as long as the fathom, and in the *Sāmudrika* this is reckoned to be an auspicious sign. The Tibetans take it to imply the simious peculiarity of the hands reaching below the knee."

तत्रास्यामविस्तारोच्छेदः निर्गमैः—

The first three words in this line, *viz.*, *āyāma*, *vistāra* and *uccheda* are the names of different kinds of measurement; the first denotes the measurement of the length, the second of the width and the third of the thickness or height, of the object to be measured. These are the same as *māna*, *pramāṇa* and *un-māna* respectively, three of the six kinds of measurement described in Sanskrit authorities; the other three are *parimāṇa*, *upamāṇa* and *lambamāṇa*, *i.e.*, the measurement of girths or of the periphery—the terms for this used in this text are *parimāṇa* and *parikṣepa*,—the measurements of interspaces, and the measurements taken along plumb lines (*cf.* Gopinath Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Vol. I, Part II, *The Uttama-Daśa-Tāla Measure*, pp. 4-5).

The last three words are interesting, as they are anatomical terms to be met with in ancient Indian medical works like that of *Suśruta*.

Sandhi (joints)—*Suśruta* speaks of two different kinds of *sandhis*, *viz.*, *cala* (flexible) and *acala* (inflexible) and he says that their number is 210. These joints are those of bones; but the joints of the muscles, nerves and veins are innumerable (*Suś.*, *Śārīrasthānam*, Ch. V, 29). It is evident that only a few of these can be actually outlined in the images of the Buddha. But as regards the prominent delineation of the muscles, bones and joints in the figures of Buddha and other divinities, the two of the 80 lesser signs (अशीति अनुव्यञ्जनानि) of great men should be noted; these two are निर्गूढशिरः and निर्गन्धिशिरः. A





PLATE 1.



line from *Sukranītisāra* will also be of interest in this connection—गूढसम्यस्थिधमनी सर्वदा सौख्यवर्द्धिनी (Ch. IV, sec. iv, verse 146).

Bandhas (ligaments, tendons or sinews)—These are most probably referred to by Suśruta as the 16 *kaṇḍarās* (tendons) and 4 great *māmsarajjus*, because both these categories serve the purpose of binding, the former, the principal sections of the body, while the latter, the muscles. But in relation to images, the importance of these is practically immaterial.

Nirgamas (orifices or outlets)—These are the same as the 9 *srotas* (in the case of a female body, the number is 12) of Suśruta (*Sārīrasathāna*, Ch. V, 9: श्रवणनयनघ्राणगुदमेढ्राणि नव स्रोतांसि नराणाम् बहिर्मुखानि—एतान्येव स्त्रीणामपराणि च त्रीनि;—इह स्तनयो-रधस्ताद्भक्तवहश्च) and 9 doors of the author of the *Gītā* (cf. *Gītā*, Canto V, verse 13—नवद्वारे पुरे देही). Of these, all are properly delineated in the reliefs, with the exception of the last two. Sometimes, the word *nirgama* stands as a synonym for *unmāna*, the measurement of thickness and height (cf. T. A. G. Rao, *op. cit.*, p. 5); but the word is not used in this sense in the present text.

Pramāṇam—This term is used somewhat loosely in this text. This should properly mean the measurement of the width, *māna* or *āyāma*, etc., standing for that of the length. But here, as well as in a few other places of this text, the word signifies the latter.

स्तेनाङ्गुलिप्रमाणेन.....पञ्चविंशत्युत्तरम्—

Anguli served as a unit of measurement in India from very early times. In the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* (10. 2. i. 2) the author says that Prajāpati measures the fire-altar by *finger-breadths*; for the sacrifice being a man, it is by means of him that everything is measured here; these fingers are his lowest measure (*tasyai-śāvamā mātrā yadaṅgulayaḥ*) and the measurement is taken with the help of this lowest measure. Three different kinds of

āṅgulas can be distinguished : (1) a *mānāṅgula* or an absolute unit ; it was derived as we know from the *Bṛhatsamhitā* from the measurements of some natural objects :

जालान्तरगे भानी यदणुतरं दर्शनं रजो याति ।

तद्विन्द्यात् परमाणं प्रथमं तद्वि प्रमाणानाम् ॥

परमाणुरजो बालाग्रलिक्ष्यकं यवोऽङ्गुलं चेति ।

अष्टगुणानि यथोत्तरमङ्गुलमेकं भवति सङ्ख्या ॥

i.e., a mote in the sunbeam is known as *paramāṇu*, 8 such = 1 *raja* ; 8 *rajas* = 1 *bālāgra* ; 8 *bālāgras* = 1 *likṣa* ; 8 *likṣas* = 1 *yūka* ; 8 *yūkas* = 1 *yava* ; 8 *yavas* = 1 *Āṅgula* (*Bṛhatsamhitā*, 57, 182); (2) a *mātrāṅgula*, a relative unit, derived from the measurement of the middle digit of the medius of 'either the sculptor or the architect or of the rich devotee who causes a temple to be built or an image to be set up.' 'Another kind of *āṅgula* is obtained by dividing the whole length of the body of an image into 124, 120 or 116 equal parts : each of these divisions is called a *deha-labdha-āṅgula* or shortly *dehāṅgula*' (T. A. G. Rao, *op. cit.*, p. 2). This 'relative measure' was very frequently adopted by the artists in the construction of images. From calculations of measurements of some Buddha statues in the Indian Museum, I have come to the conclusion that this *dehāṅgula* is in some cases the same as the breadth measurement of the middle digit of the medius of the image. Thus the term *svena* (*svakīyena*) can be explained. But Dr. Fleet will not lay stress on this term *svena* = *sva-mānena*. He writes : "As regards the expression *sva-mānena*, it stands to reason that the measures must be taken according to an *āṅgula* or a cubit which is of a fixed standard length ; not according to the varying finger breadths and cubits of individuals who are to be measured." (*JRAS.*, 1911, pp. 208-09.) The term *svenāṅguli pramāṇena* is also significant, for the true sense of the term *pramāṇa* is emphasised here—*pramāṇa* referring to the width of the middle finger and certainly not its length. (For the length of the

medius serving as a unit of Greek measurement, see footnote, of the Introduction, above.)

Another manner in which this 'relative' *āṅgula* unit was reached is referred to by the author of the *Sukranītisāra*; this is the 4th part of the fist of the image; cf. ख-ख-मुष्टेचतुर्थोऽंशो ह्यङ्गुलं परिकीर्तितम्; Ch. IV, sec. 4, verse 82. In the text of *Pratimāmāna-lakṣaṇam* edited by Mr. P. Bose, we practically find the same definition of the *āṅgula* in the first line of the verse 4 (पल्लवानां चतुर्भागे मापनाङ्गुलिका स्मृता) where in place of *muṣṭi*, the word *pallava* is used; the latter may mean here the width in the middle of the palm of the hand (the width of the middle of the palm and that of the fist evidently is the same). The compiler of the *Pratimāmāna-lakṣaṇam*, however, does not expressly lay down whose *pallava* it is to be. But from the context in the *Sukranītisāra*, it appears that the fist of the image itself is meant.

In this connection, Utpala's comment, on Varāhamihira's statement खैरङ्गुलप्रमाणैः is to be noted: खैरङ्गुलप्रमाणैरिति प्रतिमायाः खैरात्मीयैरङ्गुलप्रमाणैः. Not only this, but Utpala's explanation of the unit *āṅgula* here is also interesting. He says: यस्मात् काष्ठात् पाषाणादिकाद् वा प्रतिमा क्रियते तद्वैर्घ्यं पीठप्रमाणविवर्जितं द्वादशभागविभक्तं कृत्वा तत्रैकोभागो नवधा कार्यः सोऽङ्गुलसंज्ञा भवति. Thus, according to Utpala, the unit *āṅgula* is the 108th part of the block of wood or slab of stone from which the image without its pedestal is to be made. His reason for this conclusion is given in the next line—यस्मादष्टाधिकमङ्गुलग्रतं प्रतिमाप्रमाणं वक्ष्यति, i.e., because the length of the image is said to be 108 *āṅgulas*. So, this unit is nothing but the *dehalabdha āṅgula* or *dehāṅgula* referred to above. But one remark can be made here with regard to Utpala's manner of defining the term *āṅgula*. He says it is the 108th part of the measured material from which the image is to be made, only leaving out the pedestal (*pīṭha*). If by *pīṭha*, he means the stele (the *pīṭhikā* or *pindika* and *prabhāvali* combined) of the image, then he is quite correct. But if he means only the pedestal, then some difficulty arises here;

because, from the portion of the material without the pedestal, not only the image itself, but also the *śiraścakra* (halo) of the image as well as the top section of the *prabhāvalī* was carved out. One other observation can be made in this connection ; this division into 108th parts refers to *navatāla* images only, not to images of larger (*daśatāla* and *Uttamadaśatāla*) or smaller (*aṣṭatāla*, *saptatāla*, etc.,) proportions (but cf. our observations about *tāla* below). The following couplet from *Agnipurāṇa* (Vaṅgabāśī ed., Ch. IV) can be referred to in this connection :

शिलां, शिल्पी तु नवधा विभज्य नवमेऽंशे ।

सूर्यभक्तैः शिलायान्तु भागं स्वाङ्गलमुच्यते ॥

Our text lays down 120 *angulas* as the length measurement of the Bodhisattva images and 125 *angulas* of the Buddha images. In the Chinese rendering of this text, there is neither any reference to Bodhisattva images nor to 125 *angulas* as the measurement of the Buddha ones ; the Chinese translator simply lays down 120 *angulas* as the length of the latter. If 12 *angulas* be regarded as the length of the face (1 *tāla*—for its use in Indian literature, see later), then the Buddha image according to the Chinese version is of *daśatāla* measure. But as we shall see presently, according to our text the length of the face is equivalent to $13\frac{1}{2}$ *angulas* (in the Chinese translation, $12\frac{1}{2}$ is put in place of $13\frac{1}{2}$; it should be observed here, that $12\frac{1}{2}$ multiplied by 10 is equal to 125, the whole length of the Buddha figure according to our Sanskrit original. Prof. Grünwedel says, on what authority he does not state, “The statue of Buddha should measure from the top of the *uṣṇīṣa* to the sole 125 fingers, so also the length of the outstretched arms measures 125 fingers” (*Buddhist Art*, p. 167, f. n. 1).

According to Varāhamihira the images of Dāśarathi Rāma and Vairocana Bali are to be made 120 *angulas* in height, all the others being less than this measure, by 12 *angulas*. But among the latter, three classes are distinguished *pravara*, *sama* and *nyūna* (*Bṛhatsamhitā*, Ch. 57, verse 30). I cannot help

quoting here at some length, a portion of the interesting comment of Utpala on this verse of Varāhamihira : शेषा अन्याः प्रतिमा द्वादशहान्या द्वादशकद्वादशकहोनत्वेन प्रवरसमन्यूनपरिमाणा भवन्ति । विंशत्यधिकादङ्गुलशताद् द्वादशाङ्गुलान्यपास्याष्टाधिकं शतमङ्गुलानां प्रतिमा प्रधाना भवति । ततोऽपि द्वादशकमपास्य षष्ठ्यवत्यङ्गुलसमा मध्यमा भवति । ततोऽपि द्वादशकमपास्य चतुरश्रवत्यङ्गुला न्यूनपरिमाणा प्रतिमा भवति । “स्त्रैरङ्गुलप्रमाणैर्द्वादशविस्तीर्णमायतं च मुख”मित्यनेन न्यायेन या प्रतिमोक्ता साष्टाङ्गुलं शतमधिकं भवति यदत्रोक्तं “दशरथतनयो राम बलिश्च वैरोचनिः शतं विंश”-मित्यस्मिन् द्वादशानामङ्गुलानामधिकानां तैरधिकेन परिमाणः कार्यः सर्वावयवानाम् । एवं होनत्वेऽप्यनुपात एवेत्यनुक्तं ज्ञायत इति ॥

One should refer in this connection to the *Uttama*, *madhyama* and *adhama tāla* measurements as quoted from *Kāraṇa* and other *āgamas* by T. A. G. Rao (*op. cit.*, pp. 6-7). But nowhere in the references quoted above is any image of any deity given such a height as 125 *āṅgulas* (the *Uttama daśatāla* measure is 124 *āṅgulas* only ; but this measure only appears in such comparatively late texts as the *Śilpaśāstras* and *āgamas*, not in earlier ones like Ch. 57 of the *Bṛhatsamhitā*).

Now another interesting point can be raised here with regard to the use of the word *tāla* in Sanskrit iconometrical works. We have carefully scanned the earliest extant work on iconometry (*Bṛhatsamhitā*, Ch. 57, earlier portion) and we have found that neither the text nor the commentary of Utpala on it explicitly refers to the word *tāla* or its equivalents, such as *vitasti*, *mukha*, *yama*, *arka*, *rāśi* or *jagatī*, serving as the higher unit of measuring the height of the image. Kāśyapa, also, as quoted at some length by Utpala (*Br. S.*, pp. 776-8) is silent about this feature of Indian iconometry. Our text too follows these earlier works and do not mention the word *tāla*. It however occurs in *Sukranītisāra*, where this higher unit is, for all times, made up of 12 *āṅgulas*, each of which, as we have seen above, is $\frac{1}{4}$ th part of the fist of the image, Ch. IV, sec. IV, v. 82 :

स्वस्व-मुष्टेश्चतुर्थोऽंशो ह्यङ्गुलं परिकीर्तितम् ।

तदङ्गुलैर्द्वादशभिर्भवेत् तालस्य दीर्घता ॥

The text of *Pratimāmāna-lakṣaṇa*, edited by Mr. P. Bose, supplies us with the same information in these lines :

हादशाङ्गुलितालं च वितस्तिर्मुखमेव च । (३)

पञ्चवानां चतुर्भांगो मापनाङ्गुलिका स्मृता । (४)

Does this fact justify us in giving the text being edited by us a much earlier date than that of either the *Sukranītisāra* or *Pratimā-mānalakṣaṇam*? That *tāla* as a higher unit in iconometry was a later introduction seems to be proved by the fact that such terms as *daśatāla*, *pañcatāla*, etc., cannot be satisfactorily explained in their relation to the smaller unit *aṅgula*. I cannot help quoting the following lines from Gopinath Rao for elucidating my point: "The reader would be inclined to believe that the phrases *daśatāla*, *pañcatāla*, and *eka-tāla* mean lengths equal to ten, five and one *tāla* respectively, but unfortunately this interpretation does not seem to agree with the actual measurements; for example, the total length of an image made according to the *Uttama-daśatāla* measurement is 124 *aṅgulas* and the *tāla* of this image measures $13\frac{1}{2}$ *aṅgulas*; dividing the total length by the length of the *tāla* we find that there are only 9 *tālas* in it; again, the total length of a *catustāla* image is 48 *aṅgulas* and its *tāla* is 8 *aṅgulas* and therefore there are six *tālas* in this set of proportions" (*Tāla-māna* or *Iconometry*, p. 35). His authority as regards his assertion about the length of the *tāla* in the above cases, is the *āgama* literature (cf. his table in *op. cit.*, pp. 36-7). But he could not offer any satisfactory explanation of this discrepancy; his remark "that there is no etymological significance clearly visible in the names given to the various proportions" (*ibid*, p. 35) is no explanation. What seems to me to be the possible cause at its root, is the fact that originally there was no *tāla* unit of such varying measurements as referred to in the later *āgamic* literature; over and above the smaller *aṅgula* unit, a higher one computed in terms of *aṅgula* was known but only used in differentiating between the *pravara*, *sama*, and *nyūna* images of Varāhamihira (cf. Utpala's comment on these divisions

in the lines quoted above). This larger unit was composed of 12 *aṅgulas*, but never referred to as a *tāla*. Unfortunately Nagna-jit's work has not been discovered and he as an author of this kind of literature is only known from Varāhamihira's reference to him and Utpala's quotation of one and a half verses of his (one will be referred to in the next note, the other line is **इष्टुला केशरेखैवं सुखं स्यात् षोडशाङ्गुलम्**); and so there is no knowing whether the 14 *aṅgula* lengthwise measurements of the face (for it refer to the next note) did actually serve the purpose of a higher unit. Thus, it is quite probable that the *tāla* of different measurements was comparatively a late feature in the iconometrical system of India. The earlier method of arriving at the smaller and higher units was a much simpler and practical one, while the later one seems to be somewhat unpractical and complex.

Mr. W. S. Hadaway explains *tāla* (he writes '*thalam* meaning a short span') and *aṅgula* in a slightly different way (*Some Hindu Silpa Śāstras*, O. Z., 1914, p. 37). According to him, the actual image in order to be made in accordance with one definite system, should have its total height divided into one of 5 different sets of proportions, viz., 10, 9, 8, 7 or 5 equal parts of the whole height, i.e., *daśa*, *nava*, *aṣṭa*, *sapta* or *pañca tālas*, respectively; the *tāla* is now divided into 12 equal parts, each part being termed an *aṅgula* which is again divided into 8 equal parts called *yavas* for the purpose of more minute measurement. But from what has been written above about *aṅgula*, it is clear that on the authority of the earliest dateable text, the lower unit was derived independently of the higher one at an early age. It may be observed, however, that Mr. Hadaway based his conclusions not only on comparatively late South Indian texts but on the actual method followed by the modern South Indian *sthapatis*. There is, of course little or no difference in the resultant measure in both these methods.

Here the grammar as well as the metre is somewhat faulty ; but this may be due to the mistake of the copyist. The face, here, is $13\frac{1}{2}$ *mātrās* or *aṅgulas* (cf. *mātrāṅgula*) in length ; it is divided into 3 parts, viz., the portion from the hair-line to the place where the two brows join (*lalāṭa* = 4 *aṅ.*), then the whole length of the nose (*nāṣikā* = 4 *aṅ.*), and last from below the septum of the nose to the end of the chin (*cibukāntam*—the measurement is not distinctly mentioned here, but the author simply remarks that it is *sādhika* and does not expressly state the length of the last portion as $5\frac{1}{2}$ *aṅ.*). But from *Kriyā-samuccaya*, we get $4\frac{1}{2}$ *aṅ.* as the length of each of the three parts of the face. The Chinese translator has put $12\frac{1}{2}$ in place of $13\frac{1}{2}$, the above three constituent sections of the *mukha* measuring 4, 4 and $4\frac{1}{2}$ *aṅgulas* respectively. Varāhamihira, in his *Br̥hatsamhitā*, Ch. 57, v. 4, says that the length as well as the width of the face should be 12 *aṅgulas*; but he, at the same time, refers to the *Drāviḍa* measurement referred to by Nagnajit, where the length of the face is 14 *aṅgulas*, while its width is 12. Utpala actually quotes this couplet from Nagnajit's work :—

विस्तीर्णं द्वादशमुखं दैर्घ्येण च चतुर्दश ।

अङ्गुलानि तथा कार्यं तन्मानं द्राविडं स्मृतं ॥

[In *passim* it may be pointed out that Mr. T. A. G. Rao was not quite correct when he made the following statement : 'the quotation also incidentally informs us that Nagnajit was possibly a Dravidian author on *Śilpa-śāstra*' ; because the manner in which this *Drāviḍa* school of measurement is referred to by Nagnajit rather shows that he was other than a Dravidian by race.]

Mention may be made in this connection of Varāhamihira's enumeration of the characteristic features of the *mālavyas* (one of the 5 classes of men, viz., *hamsaḥ*, *śaśaḥ*, *rucakaḥ*, *bhadraḥ*, and *mālavyaḥ* born when the planets *Br̥haspati*, *Śanaīścara*, *Maṅgala* [*Kuja*], *Budha* and *Sukra* are ascendant respectively); these are : prominent nose, long arms of equal length reaching to the

knees, fleshy joints, handsome body, lean in the middle (all these remind us of some of the 32 signs of the great Buddha) and the length of his face is 5+8 (पञ्चाष्टौ चोर्ध्वमास्यं) etc. Utpala thus comments on these words :

पञ्च च अष्टौ च पञ्चाष्टौ त्रयोदशाङ्गुलानि । ऊर्ध्वमास्यमूर्ध्वमानेनास्यं
चिबुकाङ्गुलान्तं यावत् त्रयोदशाङ्गुलं भवति (Br. S., Ch. 68, v. 10 and
Commentary). It may also be observed here, that the $13\frac{1}{2}$ as
the length of the face was not put in place of the original 12 or
 $12\frac{1}{2}$ in our text, quite accidentally by the interpolator; for as
my remarks in the last note will prove, that $13\frac{1}{2}$ was actually
regarded as the length of the *mukha* or *tāla* in the *Uttamadaśa-*
tāla types of icons, in the later period. In the original Sanskrit
text, the length of the face was probably put in as 12 or $12\frac{1}{2}$
as the Chinese version shows; and in a later recension of the
same text, $13\frac{1}{2}$ was put in its place by one who was perhaps
conversant with the peculiarities of the *Uttamadaśa-tāla* measure-
ment.

हनुः—In the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (1,3), the words *uttarā-*
hanu and *adharāhanu* occur in the sense of upper and lower
jaws respectively. Varāhamihira (Ch. 57, 5) says द्वे अङ्गुले च
हनुनी; Utpala comments on it thus: हनुनी द्वे द्वे अङ्गुले च विस्तृते ।
मुखगलसन्धी हनुनी. So, according to Utpala, 'the place where
the face and the neck join is the *hanu*' (it is certainly not
'chin,' as Mr. T. A. G. Rao puts it in his *Tālamāna*, p. 77; it
more appropriately refers to the jaw). It is however, very
difficult to measure this part of the images and test the accuracy
of these iconometrical texts.

महासिंहहनु—*Simhahanu*, or (the possession of) the lion-like
jaws, is the 11th of the 32 *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas*. According to
the *Lalitavistara* text (*Lalitavistara*, Bib. Indica edition, p. 136),
Simhahanu was the name of the Bodhisattva's grandfather.
Rhys Davids translates the *lakṣaṇa simhahanu* thus: his jaw is as
a lion's, i.e., with the lower jaw relatively fuller than the upper'
(*Dialogues of the Buddha*, part II, p. 15, f.n. 8).

चत्वारिंशददन्ताः स्मृताः—*Catvāriṃśaddantaḥ* is the 6th one of the 32 *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas* (*Mahāvvyutpatti* list). It is hardly necessary to point out that the reference to this characteristic sign is thoroughly out of place here; for no Buddha image with mouth open and teeth bare is known. It is interesting, however, to note how in ancient India, the possession of more than the natural number of teeth was regarded as an auspicious characteristic of great men : cf. the description of the divine dwellers of the Śvetadwīpa as **षष्ट्या दन्तैर्युक्ताः** (*Mahābhārata*, XII. 135. 11).

गोची (गोजी)—It is “the short vertical dimple between the centre of the upper lip” and the nasal septum (not the bridge of the nose, as wrongly put down by T.A.G. Rao in his ‘*Tālamāna*,’ p. 113). In the *Bṛhatsamhitā* (Ch. 57, v. 9), it is called *gocchā* whose width is put down there as $\frac{1}{2}$ an *aṅgula*.

नासावंश—Nasal septum. Mr. Rao explains *vaṁśa* as ‘the bridge of the nose, same as *puṣkara* (the wall between the nostrils)’ but the term ‘bridge’ in this connection, refers to the upper outer end of this wall, while *nāsāvaṁśa* here means its lower base ; so it is correctly rendered into English by the word ‘septum.’

नेत्रान्तरैःङ्गुले ज्ञेयो, etc.—In the Chinese version, the distance between the eyes, is spoken of as 8 parts; if these be *yavas*, then 8 such would comprise a *mānāṅgula*. But, even so, it may not be an absolute unit. The *dehāṅgula*, (relative unit) is divided into 8 parts, each of which may be designated as a *yava*. It is very likely the relative unit is referred to in a round about way in the Chinese version.

दृष्टि.....तयोः—The sense is not quite clear here. About the proportions of the different sections of the eye, the following couplet from *Bṛhatsamhitā*, Ch. 57, 11 is of practical use :

दृष्टिः क्षमितोऽक्षिकोशो द्वे नेत्रे तन्निभागिका तारा ।

दृक्ततारा पञ्चांशो नेत्रविकाशोऽङ्गुलं भवति ॥

The third *carāṇa* in this couplet is meant to describe the same peculiarity which is so obscurely referred to in our line. Utpala comments on this *carāṇa* thus : **इक्ष्वाकरा मध्यवर्तिनी कुमारी अङ्गुलद्वयपञ्चांशः पञ्चांशभागः**. But we do not see the reason for this insistence on eye-sight (*dr̥ṣṭi*) in our text. In the Buddha figures of the Gupta period and afterwards, the eyes are generally half closed and a sort of dreamy down-cast look is discernible on the face. In Gandhāra specimens of inferior merit and other indifferent productions of the mediaeval period, however, an unseemly stare is present.

Samudga is the pupil and *tārā*, the eye ball (**नेत्रमध्ये कृष्णो भागः**, Utpala), whereas *dr̥ṣṭi* is 'the centre of the pupil of the eye' (T. A. G. Rao, *op. cit.*, p. 113). In stone or wooden images, unless they were painted, there was practically very little need on the part of the sculptors for these particulars; but in painted images, in pictures and in some metal ones which were inlaid with little bits of silver or other precious metals, these minute directions were to a certain extent necessary (*cf.* the Nālanda miniature brass and bronze images of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, where eye balls and *urnās* are marked by the insertion of little bits of silver).

In the Chinese translation of this text, the *samudga* is $\frac{1}{8}$ th in place of $\frac{1}{4}$ th.

करवीरसमं सूत्रं.....परियोजयेत्—

This couplet is completely omitted in the Chinese version. But it contains some helpful instructions to the sculptor. He is to place the lateral ends of the wings of the nose in the same line with the *karavīra* of the eyes while the two lateral ends of the mouth (*śṛṅggaṇī*) as well as of the chin should be placed in the same line with the eye ball.

Karavīra is a little known word. Varāhamihira lays down (Ch. 57, 13) that it should measure an *āṅgula* and be marked in the near corner of each eye. Utpala explains it thus : **करवीरकं द्विविक्रितिं प्रसिद्धम्**. Gopinath Rao remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 113)

“*Karavīra*,(?) some part connected with the eye (something at the end of the eyes. Is it the red flesh?)” The author of the *Kriyāsamuccaya* correctly explains करवीर as नासासमीपं नेत्रान्तः.

उर्णा—*Urṇākeśa* is the 4th of the 32 *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas* (the 31st one in the *Mahāpadāna* list). As our text informs us it should be marked in the middle between the two inner ends of the eye brows. It means ‘tuft of hair.’ In the Chinese version, nothing about *urṇā* is mentioned; but in its place, it is laid down there that the shape of the eye-brow should be like the first moon. Prof. Grünwedel’s remark about this is interesting : “The tuft (*urṇā*) between the brows must have had its origin in the superstition that men whose brows run into each other are specially gifted. The representations of Buddha give the *urṇā* in the form of a small round protuberance over the root of the nose, which in older and more modern figures is frequently replaced by a pearl and so on” (*Buddhist Art*, p. 162). But it may be remarked here that in the Buddha figures of different periods, both in India and Indonesia, the *urṇā* is not invariably present. In the Buddha figures from different parts of Gandhāra it is almost always marked (for a possible exception, see *Buddhist Art*, p. 169, figure 117, the face of which is described by the author as ‘an austere, rather cold, Hindu face with a coarse moustache’); in the seated Buddha figure (N.S. 3936) in the Gandhāra room, Indian Museum, there is a slight depression in the place of *urṇā*, and as the image shows traces of paint, the *urṇā* might have been painted in colours; in N. S. 4820 also a seated Buddha in the same place, a hole $\frac{1}{10}$ th of an inch deep and $\frac{1}{2}$ an inch in diameter, just above the bridge of the nose, definitely proves that originally a precious stone was inserted in the hollow, thus serving the purpose of *urṇā*. In the Buddha figures from Mathurā, it is occasionally present; so, Coomaraswamy’s statement that, ‘there is no *urṇā* in the early Kuṣāṇ Buddha type’ (*HIIA*, p. 57) is to be taken with some reservation. Thus, in the two standing Buddha images in bay No. 1 of the Gupta gallery, Indian

Museum, as well as in the standing one reproduced in Coomaraswami's *History of Indian and Indonesian Art* (pl. XL, fig. 158; the original is in the Mathurā Museum), it is conspicuous by its absence; whereas, in others which are usually earlier in point of date (the standing Mathurā images referred to above are probably to be dated in the 5th century A. D.) it is clearly shown (*cf.* the Kātrā Buddha image of the early Kuṣāṇa period in the Mathurā Museum, Coomaraswamy, *op.cit.*, pl., XXIII, fig. 84 ; also *cf.* the seated inscribed image in bay No. 1 of the Gupta gallery of the Indian Museum and No. A, 4, *M. M. cat.*, p. 49 & pl., XVa, where the *urnā* is not a raised protuberance, but a tiny space just above the bridge of the nose marked off by a circle with a dot inside it) ; *in passim* it may be remarked that the *urnā* very seldom looks like a curled tuft of hair; I know of only one Buddha image (J. I. in the Indian Museum and it hails from Java), where *urnā* is really shown as a curl of hair, turned in accordance with the textual injunction from left to right. Almost all the Buddha images, whether standing or seated, of the Gupta period do not bear this mark at all ; there is no doubt that here was a distinct departure on the part of the indigenous artists from one of the conventions adopted by the Hellenistic artists of Gandhāra. But curiously enough a Bodhisattva figure from Sarnath (Fig. S. 26 in the Gupta gallery of the Indian Museum) bears this mark in almost the same manner as the seated Buddha in red sandstone in the Indian Museum, noticed above. The colossal copper image of Buddha found at Sultangunj near Bhagalpur and now in the South Kensington Museum, dated by Coomaraswamy in the 5th century A. D., does not bear this mark on the forehead. In the Nalanda bronze miniatures of Buddha, as well as stone figures, this is almost invariably present, which is the case with the other mediaeval Buddha figures hailing from other parts of India. As regards Indonesian Buddha images, the artists there, generally followed the example of the early medieval Indian sculptors.

It will be of interest to remark, in this connection, that the place where *urnā* is shown on the Buddha statues, is occupied by the *tilak* in the medieval Viṣṇu images; in Śiva figures, the god's third eye is put on the identical spot. But it may be pointed out that in these cases also, the artists (specially of Gupta period) took liberties of their own; thus, in the beautiful Śiva figure in the collection of the Indian Museum (Ms. 3. Anderson's *Catalogue*, II, p. 349) the third eye is conspicuous by its absence; but Śiva in the inscribed Śiva-Pārvatī image from Kosam (d. 458-9 A. D.) bears on its forehead the third eye placed side-ways in the middle.

शिरोमणिः.—This term is to be literally translated as the 'Crest jewel.' It is most likely the same as *uṣṇīṣa* which has already been mentioned in the prose portion of the text (**कृत्वाकारः शिरःस्कन्धा संस्थितोष्णीषेत्यादि सुसंस्थानात्**). It is one of the most important and interesting *mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas*. The early Buddhist texts like *Mahāpadāna* and *Lakkhana suttāntas* of the *Dīgha Nikāya* (Vols. II & III) refer to it as *uṇhīsasīsa*; in later Sanskrit Buddhist texts such as *Mahā-Vyutpatti*, etc., it is referred to as *uṣṇīṣaśiraskatā*. The exact interpretation of this peculiarity of a Buddha, especially in connection with its representation in Buddhist iconoplastic art of different periods, has engaged the attention of many a scholar. Prof. Grünwedel, on the authority of previous scholars like M. E. Burnouf and on the basis of M. Fouceaux's translation of this term in Tibetan *Lalitavistara*, rendered *uṣṇīṣa* as "a cranial protuberance" (*Bud. Art*, p. 162). The exact significance of this *lakṣaṇa* has since then been discussed by various scholars such as M. A. Foucher (*L'Art Graeco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*, t. II., p. 295 etc.), L. A. Waddell (*Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, 1915, pp. 131-68), A. C. Coomaraswamy (*J. R. A. S.*, 1928, pp. 815 ff.) among others and different explanations have been given.

There is no doubt, that at a time when our text was composed, the term *uṣṇīṣa* was understood to mean a peculiar 'abnormal development of the upper surface of the skull into a

small truncated cone covered with flesh, skin and hair' (Watters); and in some places of this iconographic text about Buddha image, this is most probably alluded to as the pure (विमलः), and effulgent (सुप्रभः) crest-jewel (शिरोमणिः), evidently being taken as something concrete which represented *bodhiñāna*, the wisdom par excellence. But, that in the earlier days this was not the sense attributed to this term is not only proved by Buddhaghosha's explanation of it, but also the original etymological sense of the word *uṣṇīṣa*. This word at first meant 'a turban,' usually 'a royal turban,' which was derived from its etymological sense, "a protection from the sun," "sun-shade," and this was always the premier significance attached to it. Buddhaghosha explained the *lakṣaṇa uṣṇīṣasīsa* as referring to the well-developed forehead (*paripunṇanalātatañ*) and the well-developed head (*paripunṇasīsa*) of the *Mahāpurisa* or Buddha. Dr. Rhys Davids remarks about the explanation of Buddhaghosha : "In either case, the rounded highly developed appearance is meant, giving to the unadorned head the decorative dignified effect of a crested turban and the smooth symmetry of a water-bubble." Thus, according to Dr. Rhys Davids, Buddhaghosha explains the term in two different ways. But, both the senses of *paripunṇanalātata* and *paripunṇasīsa* seem to be comprised under the term from the context in Buddhaghosha's commentary (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, Pt. II, page 16 f. n. 4). In any case, the silence of Buddhaghosha about the later sense of the term *uṣṇīṣa* is significant. The learned commentator's twofold explanation of this *lakṣaṇa* can be better understood, if we refer to the *śīraḥlalāta-lakṣaṇas* of great men in Brāhmanical literature such as the *Mahābhārata*, *Bṛhatsamhitā* and *Sāmudrikaśāstra*. The great gods Nara and Nārāyaṇa, visited by Nārada in the *Vadarikāśrama*, are characterised by 'heads like umbrellas,' which sign is described as a *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa* (Mbh., XII, 343, 38 :—आतपत्वेण सट्टशे शिरसो देवयोस्तयोः । एवं लक्षणसम्पन्नौ महापुरुष-संज्ञितौ ॥. Varāhamihira describes the heads of *Cakra-varttins*

as resembling the shape of an umbrella (*Br. S.*, Ch. 67, v. 79: कृत्वाकारैः शिरोभिरवनीशाः ; Utpala's comment: कृत्वाकारैश्चक्राकृतिभिरुर्ध्वभागविस्तृतैरवनीशा राजानः). The *Sānudrikaśāstra* tells us that he whose head resembles an open umbrella or the breast of a young lady is destined to be a *sārvabhauma* monarch (*Sānudrika Ś.*, Venkateśwara Press, Bombay, p. 78). Buddhaghosha's other explanation of the sign as referring to the high broad expanse of the forehead can be understood by similar passages in Brāhmanical literature referring to the *lalāta-lakṣaṇas* of kings and great men. Thus Varāhamihira says that the rich (great) men are characterised by foreheads like a half-moon in appearance ; men with broad *śuktis* (portions of skull-bone) are instructors of persons (*Br. S.*, Ch. 67, vs. 30-2; धनवन्तोऽर्द्धेन्दुसदृशेन ललाटेन ; शक्तिविशालैराचार्यता). The *Sānudrikaśāstra* also tells us the same thing in this couplet :

विपुलमूर्ध्मधिकमुन्नतमर्द्धेन्दुसन्धितं राज्यम् ।

प्रदिशत्याचार्यपदं शक्तिविशालं नृणां भालम् ॥

(p. 74). Thus, from a simultaneous consideration of the Buddhist as well as Brāhmanical texts about the characteristic features of great men's heads, we can conclude that the real meaning of this term had at first nothing to do with the sense of the abnormal peculiarity in Buddha heads, which only came into existence at a comparatively late period.

There is every reason for believing that the top-knot of hair which is usually to be found on the earliest Buddha figures of Gandhāra, in its plastic form was responsible for endowing the term *uṣṇīṣa* with a novel significance. The evidence of the early Kuṣaṇ Buddha figures of Mathurā definitely lays down that the artists there had at first shown Buddha with hair drawn tightly above his head ending in a single *kapardda* coil turning from left to right ; be it noted, however, that there are no grounds for any assumption that this *dakṣiṇāvarta* spiral coil of hair represented the *lakṣaṇa uṣṇīṣaśiraskatā*. It is most likely, if not certain, that this sign

was meant to be represented by the early indigenous artists in the well-shaped full fleshy foreheads and the high broad cranium on the centre of which the *kapardḍa* coil rested. The Gandhāra artists' top-knot of hair, on the other hand, on the heads of the Buddha images, was conceived later to hide inside it some conical upward projection of the immediate centre of Buddha's cranium and once this misunderstanding took place, other Buddha images were made in which this abnormality was given distinct shape. But it must be observed, that even then, the original form of representing the hair-knot was not definitely lost sight of in Gandhāra, and we know of many beautiful stucco heads of Buddha to be dated in the 5th century A.D., in which the older formula is distinctly recognisable. The introduction of the short curls turning from left to right will be discussed in the next note (for my detailed observations on this *lakṣaṇa*, see *Indian Historical Quarterly*, September, 1931, pp. 499-514 ; for other interpretations of the same, see *ibid*, Sept., 1931, pp. 669-73 and *Golden Book of Tagore*, 1931).

The Buddha figure having a distinct cranial bump with short curls arranged all over it, came to stay and the statues of the master hailing not only from different corners of India, but also from Indonesia and Central Asia, bear this peculiarity; but in many cases, new elements were added. Thus the Buddha head from Laos (*L'Art Graeco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*, tome II, fasc. II, p. 731, fig. 571) shows this bump being crowned by a shooting flame conventionally represented ; the one from Siam (*ibid*, p. 731, fig. 572) shows another pointed projection above the cranial bump, while the other from Ceylon shows the *uṣṇīṣa* itself in the form of a flame (*ibid*, p. 731, fig. 570 : not as a lyre as M. Foucher has put it ; fire-balls in the upper left hand of Śiva *Naṭarāja* are represented in exactly similar manner).

In some mediaeval Buddha figures of the Pāla period, we see a jewelled *mukuta* placed on the top of the Buddha heads; Mr. N. G. Majumdar has furnished reasons for believing that these are *Ādibuddhas* (*Annual Report of the Varendra Research*

Society, 1926-7, pp. 7-10). But Dr. Coomaraswamy rightly points out that these crowned Buddhas are really the Śākya Muni Buddhas and not the mythical *Ādibuddha* of the well-developed Buddhist hierarchy of Gods (*J.R.A.S.*, 1928, p. 837).

कलाकारं शुभं नीलं—

Chatrākāraṃ mastakam—The significance of the head of the Buddha image being round in shape like the top of an umbrella has been referred to in the last note. In the prose portion, the *chatrākāra-śiraḥskandha* has already been mentioned; the full fleshy character of the shoulders, by the way, is also referred to under the term *saptotsedha* which is also one of the *mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas*. In this connection, it will be interesting to refer to the different shapes of the tops of the *liṅgas*, which are according to the *Mayamata*, 5 in number, viz., *chatrākāra*, *tripuṣākāra*, *kukkuṭaṇḍākāra*, *arddhacandrākāra*, and *budbudasadṛśa*. In the previous note, Dr. Rhys Davids' remark about the symmetry of the water-bubble like crested head of Buddha has already been referred to.

The 'blue head' of the Buddha image can be explained if we refer to one of the 32 *lakṣaṇas* of the great man, which is 'uddhagga-lomo uddhaggāni lomāni jātāni nīlāni añjana-vañṇāni kuṇḍala-vattāni dakkhināvattakajātāni' (*Dīgha Nik.*, Vol. II, p. 18). The 74th item in the list of the *anuvyañjanāni* (lesser signs) in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* is *bhramarasadṛśakeśa*, which also explains the 'blue head.' But in a metal, wooden or stone image, the hair of the head must have to be painted blue-black, in order to correctly portray this *lakṣaṇa* and it is a well-known fact that such images used to be painted in colours, of yore.

दक्षिणावर्तमूर्द्धजम्—*Mūrdhaja* is hair and *pradakṣiṇāvartakeśaḥ* ('the curls of the hair going off from left to right') is the second of the 32 *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas* in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* list.

It is a fact that in the early Hellenistic Buddha figures of Gandhāra and the early Indian ones of Mathurā, abundant locks

of hair are definitely shown. In Gandhāra, these are tied up in a top-knot above the head, the connection of which with the evolution of the *uṣṇīṣa*-bump in later images has already been mentioned. In Mathurā, however, the locks are tightly drawn up in a smooth compact mass over the head and all the hair collected together end in a single spiral coil (*kapardda*) turning from left to right (*dakṣiṇāvarta*), on the top of the head. The smoothness of the cranium of these early Kuṣāṇ Buddha heads of Mathurā led scholars to conclude that these were depicted shaven. Dr. Vögel described this peculiarity of these heads differently in different parts of his *Mathurā Museum Catalogue*; but in his latest publication on the Mathurā sculptures (*Ars Asiatica*, Vol. XV, p. 36), he is definitely of opinion that these heads are shaved. Mons. Foucher, long ago pointed out that these heads were not really shaved (Foucher, *L'Art Graeco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*, p. 700). Dr. Coomaraswamy was at first of opinion that the shaven head was one of the peculiarities of the early Mathurā Buddha figures; but later he definitely changed his opinion and accepted Foucher's view (*J.R.A.S.*, 1928, p. 827). There is no reference in the *Nidānakathā* or later Sanskrit Buddhist texts such as *Lalitavistara*, *Mahāvastu* and others about the complete shaving of Buddha's head; in the *Lalitavistara* (p. 277), it is mentioned सः खड्गेन चूडां छित्वा अन्तरीक्षे क्षिपति स्म, i.e., he cut off his *cūḍā* (the outer ends of the hair) and threw it up in the air. The earlier *Nidānakathā* informs us that from the time when Buddha did this, his hair remained of a certain uniform length throughout his life; thus, in a sense, the early Gandhāra as well as Mathurā artists did not violate the tradition, when they depicted Buddha with 'a cluster of locks of hair' turned upwards. The Mathurā artists, moreover, followed the tradition about the coil (here a single one) turning from left to right. The convention of the hair being arranged in schematic little curls, turning from left to right and disposed over the whole of the head and the cranial bump, already appears

in Gandhāra and Mathurā ; in the Buddha statues of the Gupta period onwards, this is almost invariably the custom (the single exception that we are aware of is the Mankuwār Buddha image dated in 458-9 A.D.). No excessive importance, however, was given by the artists to this *dakṣiṇāvarta* fashion in mediaeval Buddha images in India also in some early Buddha heads outside India. Thus, in the 'Indianesque' Buddha head of the Gupta period from Rombok, Phnompeñ, Cambodia (Coomaraswamy, *HIA*, pl. XXVIII, fig. 100—no *uṣṇīṣā* is discernible here ; was it broken ?) the curls are turned from right to left. In many indifferently executed mediaeval Buddha figures again, the hair curls are represented by little knobs spread all over the head ; where the haircurls are shown as such, the lowermost row of these just above the *keśarekhā* was depicted correctly, while those above were promiscuously arranged.

Varāhamihira says (*op. cit.*, Ch. 57, v. 44) that the Buddha image should have very short hairs : *sunīcakeśaśca*. Utpala comments on this word thus : सुनीचा अत्यल्पाः केशा मूर्धजा यस्य. But there was another reading of this word of Varāhamihira in Utpala's days and the latter notices it thus : केचित् सुनीतकेशश्चेति पठन्ति । सुनीता अतिनियमिताः. In this reading, there is a clear reference to the well-arranged character (*atiniyamitāḥ*) of the curls on the head of the Buddha image. Alabaster mentions a curious fact about these (*The Wheel of the Law*, Appendix, p. 312) ; "certain persons on account of the curled hairs described in the list, and shown in idols, supposed Buddha to have been a negro" (!).

A brief reference to a few figures other than those of Buddha, of a comparatively early period, which have these curls on their heads will not be out of place here. Prof. Grünwedel refers to the woolly negro-like hair of one of the lion riding figures in one of the compartments from the third archway of the east gateway of the Great Stupa at Sanchi (*Bud. Art*, pp. 33-4, fig. 10) ; but how far he is justified in describing this type as 'not an Aryan one' is open to question. The figure of a soldier (?) on an

upright of the Bharhut railing (*cf.* Cunningham, *Bharhut Stupa*, p. 32, pl. XXXII. 1) has similar curls on its head, which are curiously enough encircled by a diadem whose ends are arranged in a manner seen on the royal heads on the obverse side of the early Indo-Bactrian coins. In the head of the *Yakṣa* figure from Maholi mound (*M.M. Cat.*, p. 86 c, pl. XIV) 'the hair is arranged in short curls, turned alternately to the right and left,' naturally in an unorthodox fashion, for this is the figure of a mere atlant. In fine, we may say, that the short hair curl is certainly not a negroid feature, but an Aryan sign, for we very frequently find it also in ancient Mesopotamian and Achæmenid reliefs.

पाखौ स्यातां.....तथैव च—The reference in the Sanskrit original about beautiful locks of hair by the side of the ear is interesting. Prof. Grünwedel remarks about these locks of hair by the side of the ear in a Gandhāra Buddha: "One, the finest which the Berlin Museum possesses, even shows the coquettish locks before the ear, that were the fashion at Athens in the time of the Diadochs—successors of Alexander, and which, if I am not mistaken, are to be found on the Apollo Musagetes" (*Bud. Art*, p. 166, fig. 110). Curls by the side of the top of the ear are no doubt shown in the Buddha figures of later date, but no such stray 'coquettish locks' are depicted on them.

चितान्तरांसः—It is the 16th of the 32 *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas* in the *Mahāvīyutpatti* list. Dr. Rhys Davids translates it thus 'there is no furrow between his shoulders' and adds this interesting note to it, "*Citāntarāṃso*, lit., he has the shoulder interval filled up. The commentary explains, the two sides of the back have no depression in the middle, nor look separated, but from the small of the back upwards the fleshy covering is as a level golden slab." (*Dialogues of the Buddha*, Pt. II, p. 15, fn. 4). The word *vṛṣaskandha* (with shoulder like that of a bull) describes this physical characteristic in another way, thus, the poet Kālidāsa describes Dilipa as

व्यूढोरक्तो वृषस्कन्धः शालप्रांशुर्महाभुजः (*Raghuvamśa*, Canto I, v. 16). In the introductory prose portion of our text, the same physical feature is alluded to in a different manner, as *chatrākāra-skandha*. The umbrella-like outline of the heads of the Buddha images have already been noticed by us. But, does this sign of filled-up shoulder-intervals remind us, as in the case of the *lakṣaṇa* of the excessively long arms, of another of human ancestral traits ?

शङ्खं चक्रं.....पृथग्विधाः—

The 29th one of the 32 *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas* is *Cakrāṅkita-hastapādatalaḥ* (the palms of the hands and the soles of the feet marked with the sign of a wheel). But in this text we find several other signs which are to be shown on the palm, viz., conchshell, lotus, thunderbolt and elephant goad. In the last verse of our text, occurs 'तयो (of the feet) स्तूलं सुचक्रादि चित्राकारानु कारयेत्.' In the list of the 32 *lakṣaṇas* given in *Mahāpadāna-Suttānta*, both the palms and soles bear this auspicious *cakra* which is *sahasārāṇi sanemikāṇi sanābhikāṇi sabbākārapari-purāṇi*. In the Singalese list of the three kinds of the beauties of Buddha's person as collected by Mr. Spence Hardy (*Manual of Buddhism*, pp. 367-70), the first is the 216 *māṅgalyalakṣaṇas* of which there are 108 on each foot, the most important central one being the *cakra* flanked by a host of other signs like a conch-shell, lotus, *svastika*, elephant tusk, sword, etc. According to the Siamese tradition also, as referred to by Alabaster (*The Wheel of the Law*, pp. 111-15) the Buddha has on each of his feet 'a figure of the beautiful wheel *chakra* with its thousand spokes' around which are 108 other figures such as lotus, conch-shell, royal chowrie, royal elephant goad, two fishes, etc. (For the famous foot-print of Buddha at Siam, *Phra Bat*, with the auspicious marks drawn on it, see Alabaster, *op. cit.*, pp. 286 & following, & plate ; here the author tries to explain the significance of some of the symbols in his own way ; thus *chakra* marked on the foot was originally a poetical way of expressing

fleetness, but later, 'regarded no more as a poetic image, but as one of the most holy emblems of religion,' etc.). That such auspicious signs on the palms and soles were regarded as the characteristic feature of great men is also proved by other literary evidence ; thus in the *Bṛhatsamhitā*, Ch. 67, verses 44-50, we find mention of many such, most of which are included in the list of the 216 auspicious marks referred to above. These are very frequently mentioned in *Sāmudrika* literature.

Now, Varāhamihira while describing the image of Buddha says that his hands and feet are to be marked with lotus (*Br. Sam.*, Ch. 57, v. 44 : *padmāṅkitakaracaraṇau* ; Utpala : *karacaraṇau kamalacihnitaḥ kṛtābhi rekhābhirityarthaḥ*). Quite in keeping with the statement of Varāhamihira, almost all the Buddha images of the early and late mediaeval period (either standing or seated) in the archaeological collection of the Indian Museum, have a small eight-petalled lotus carved on the palms and soles, distinctly discernible wherever these are upturned. In Gandhāra Buddhas, the wheel-mark on the centre of the upturned palm and the soles of the feet (when the figure is depicted seated in *padmāsana*) is occasionally present ; in Mathurā, however, the *cakra*, accompanied by a *nandipāda* symbol, is almost invariably met with, whenever the palms and soles of the Buddha are on full view. In the Buddha images of the Gupta period, usually no such auspicious device is carved there. In some mediaeval Buddha images, again, we not only find the tiny lotus mark alone on the palms and soles, but other symbols like the *cakra*, the *dhvaja*, the *mīna* (twin fish) and *nandipāda-triśūla*.

In connection with the lotus-mark on the palms of some mediaeval Buddha images, an interesting observation can be made with regard to the lotus in the hands of the Brāhmanical god Viṣṇu. It is a fact, though noticed by none, that the lotus, unlike the other attributes of Viṣṇu such as *śaṅkha*, *cakra* and *gadā*, was never at first placed in one of the hands of the four-armed Viṣṇu image, in a manner in which it is shown in the

hand of his consort Lakṣmī or in those of the god Sūrya. In the early and late mediaeval images hailing from the South, as described by H. Krishna Sastri and T. A. G. Rao, it is almost invariably absent. In the few extant Viṣṇu images of the Gupta period, in the North, similar is also the case. In the mediaeval Viṣṇu images hailing from different parts of Northern India, on the other hand, we find a tiny lotus-mark (very rarely in the shape of a miniature lotus) on the upturned palm of the front right hand which is usually in the *varada* (cf. *Mathurā Museum Catalogue*, Plate XVIII; Dr. Vögel wrongly describes this image thus: 'He holds his usual emblems: *gadā* and *padma* in in his right hands'; the full-blossomed lotus which is shown behind the lower right palm of Viṣṇu is really held by his attendant consort Śrī on his right by its stalk, there being only a tiny lotus-mark in the middle of the god's own palm; by the way, this is a feature common to many of the similar *sthānaka-mūrtis* of Viṣṇu hailing from different parts of of Bengal and Bihar) or *abhaya* (cf. the Sultānpur Viṣṇu, Coomaraswamy, *op. cit.*, pl. LXIX, fig. 222) poses, like the *padmāṅka* noticed above in many of the mediaeval Buddha images. This sculptural evidence regarding the absence of the lotus as an attribute of Viṣṇu in the early and mediaeval types of his *dhruva-veras* happens to be corroborated by the earliest of the extant iconographic texts. The attributes which are given to the Viṣṇu image with as many as eight arms or four or two, in the *Brhatsaṃhitā* (Ch. 57, verses 33-35) do not include the lotus among them and are *khaḍga*, *gadā*, *śara*, *dhanu*, *kheṭaka*, *cakra* and *śaṅkha*; the remaining hand in the 8-armed image is in the *sāntida* (*abhaya*; Utpala on *sāntida*:—**द्रुभिमुख जर्ध्वाङ्गुलिः शान्तिदः करः**) pose. None of the South-Indian texts relating to the three principal types of Viṣṇu images, *sthānaka*, *āsana* and *śayana*, as collected by Mr. Gopinath Rao, refer to the lotus as an attribute of Viṣṇu; some North-Indian texts, however, such as *Agnipurāṇa*, *Viṣṇudharmottaram*, *Sukranītisāra*, *Viśva-karmāvatāra-śāstra*, etc., mention *padma* as an attribute;

but even in the latter case it must be understood with special reference to the sculptural evidence, that the lotus is the lotusmark and not a full-blossomed lotus held by its stalk. In some Viṣṇu images, however, of the mediaeval period we find a small globular object with spots all over it in one of the front hands—usually the right; it has been described as a lotus bud by scholars.

सर्वलक्षणरूपिणो लिखाः कार्याः पृथग्विधाः—

This line is omitted in the Chinese translation. Admitting the possibility of its being a late interpolation, there is still much of interest about this particular line. This text has just informed us that *śaṅkha*, *cakra*, etc., are to be marked on the palm; in the next line of the couplet it again says that different marks (लिखाः) in the shape of auspicious signs are to be made (on the palm). But, why this repetition? Perhaps here is a reference in a somewhat obscure manner to the *jālahastapāda*, (*Mahāpālā-nāsuttānta*) and *jālāṅgulihastapāda* (*Lalitavistara*) of the earlier texts. The Pāli commentators' interpretation that the *lakṣaṇa*, *jālahastapāda* does not mean 'webbed fingers and toes, [*na cammena paṭibaddhā aṅgulantaro*] but refer to uniform parallel lines (*rekhā*; is *lekhā* a misreading for *rekhā* in our text, or may it be interpreted here in the sense of lines?) on his fingers and toes, can be accepted. An attempt has been made by me to give a simple interpretation to the so-called 'webbing of the fingers' in the Gupta-Buddhas (for it refer to *Indian Historical Quarterly*, December, 1930). So, it is very likely that the same *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa* is noticed here. In the images of Buddha, these lines on the fingers and palm could not be depicted without marring the beauty of them and so ought not to have found place in a text dealing with the iconography of Buddha. But as we have pointed out in some of our previous notes, the text notices many such peculiarities which cannot be depicted in Buddha figures.

तदर्धेन तु मेढ्रः.....वृषणो चतुरङ्गुली—

These details about the measurement of the penis and testes of Buddha images are quite out of place here. We know that *kosohita-ratthagahyo* is one of the 32 characteristic signs of the great men in Pāli literature; Varāhamihira also tells us the same thing in *कोशनिगूढैर्भूपाः*. In any case, the Buddha figures, unlike those of the nude Jaina Tirthamkaras, are invariably draped; in some standing Buddha images of the Kuṣān period, hailing from Mathurā, the signs of sex are no doubt slightly indicated beneath the drapery. But in the case of the seated images and the host of images from the Gupta period onwards, these are completely concealed beneath the drapery. So, these details have no practical utility here. They seem to have been omitted in Chinese.

गूढगुल्फशिरास्थित्वं—*Gūḍhaśīratā* and *gūḍhagulphatā* are two of the 80 lesser signs (*aśītyanuvyañjanāni*); cf. previous note on the delineation of *sandhibandhanirgama* in Buddha images. **शिराविरहितता** and **सुनिगूढगुल्फता** are, according to Varāhamihira (*Br. S.*, Ch. 67, v. 2), two of the characteristic features of the feet of the lord of men (*मनुजेश्वरस्य*).


ताम्रनखाः—This is one of the 80 lesser signs. In painted images and pictures of Buddha, the nails were painted copper-coloured. **रुचिरताम्रनखता** is also, according to Varāhamihira, one of the auspicious signs of the lords of men.

कूर्मशृङ्ग.....पादो बहिरलङ्घतो ।

समन्विष्टोन्नताच्छिद्रो सुप्रतिष्ठितलक्षणो ॥

These details about the feet of Buddha figures, also appertain to the characteristic signs of a great man. The upper parts of the feet should be full and convex like the back of a tortoise; the feet should be well-planted and should fall flat, leaving not the least bit of hollow between the soles and the ground on which

they rest. The toes also will be set very close together—not splayed out. Varāhamihira tells us the same thing in these words : श्लिष्टाङ्गुली.....कूर्पोज्ञतो च चरणौ मनुजेश्वरस्य (*Br. S.*, Ch. 67, v. 2). The well-planted feet with fleshy convex shape, are very carefully depicted by the early Indian artists in the Buddha images.



APPENDIX A

I. Measurement of length sections according to our text, of a Buddha image of 120 añ. :—

<i>Uṣṇīṣa</i>	4 añ.
<i>Keśasthān</i>	2 "
Face	13½ "
Neck	4 "
Neck to chest	12½ "
Chest to navel...	12½ "
Navel to penis...	12½ "
Thigh	25 "
Knee-cap	3 "
Foreleg	25 "
<i>Gulpha</i>	2 "
<i>Pāṇṇī</i>	4 "
Total height	120 añ.

II. Same, according to the *Kriyā-samuccaya* Commentary :—

<i>Uṣṇīṣa</i> to neck	20½ añ.
Neck	4 "
Neck to chest	12½ "
Chest to navel	12½ "
Navel to penis...	12½ "
Thigh	25 "
Foreleg	25 "
Knee-cap	6 "
<i>Gulpha</i>	2 "
Below <i>gulpha</i> (<i>Pāṇṇī</i>)	4 "
Total height	124 añ.

Difference between this commentary and our text lies only in the case of longer knee-caps (3 añ. in excess) and in the measurement from the *uṣṇīṣa* to neck (1 añ. in excess). So, the commentary gives us details about a Buddha of the *Uttamadaśatāla* measure.

III. Length-measurements of a *daśatāla* *pramāṇa* image, according to *Sukranīti* :—

Face	13 añ.
Neck	5 "
Neck to chest	13 "
Chest to navel	13 "
Navel to penis	13 "
Thigh	26 "
Knee-cap	5 "
Foreleg	26 "
Down the heels	5 "
Total height	119 añ.

IV. Same of a *madhyamadaśatāla* image (of a female beauty) according to *Mānasara* (LXVI) :—

Head (crown to hair-line)...	4 añ.
Forehead (up to the eye-line)	5 "
Nose (up to the lip)	4 "
Thence to chin	3½ "
Neck-joint	½ "
Neck	4 "
From hiccough to heart	13 "
Thence to the limit of navel	13 "
Thence to sex organ	13 "
Thigh (below sex organ)	26 "
Knee	4 "
Leg	26 "
Foot	4 "

Total height ... 120 añ.


(From Dr. P. K. Acarya's *Dictionary of Hindu Architecture*, p. 230.)

IV. *Details of measurements according to our text.*

Name of the Part measured añ.			Name of the Part measured añ.		
No.		In Chinese.	No.		In Chinese.
1	<i>Uṣṇīṣa</i> ... 4		28	<i>Karṇāgra</i> ... 4	
2	<i>Keśasthān</i> ... 2	$\frac{1}{4}$ añ.	29	Ear (width) ... 2	
3	Length of the face ... $13\frac{1}{2}$	$12\frac{1}{2}$	30	Earlobes ... $5\frac{1}{2}$	$4\frac{1}{2}$
4	Forehead ... 4		31	<i>Karṇapatra</i> (width) 1	
5	Nose ... 4		32	<i>Śliṣṭaśrotra</i> (?) ... $\frac{1}{2}$	
6	Nose to chin ...	$4\frac{1}{2}$	33	Earhole (width) ... $\frac{1}{2}$	
7	Chin (breadth) ... 2		34	Ear (inner side) $2 \times 1\frac{1}{2}$	
8	„ (length and thickness). 4		35	Head (frontally) ... 18	
9	<i>Kapala</i> ... 4		36	Head (back) ... 14	
10	<i>Hanu</i> (ht.) ... 3		37	„ (periphery) ... 40	36
11	„ (width) ... 2		38	Neck ... 4	
12	Lower lip ... 2		39	„ (width) ... 8	
13	Mouth (length) ... 4		40	„ (periphery) ... 24	
14	Upper lip ... $\frac{1}{2}$		41	<i>Skandhāṁśa</i> (?) ... 12	
15	<i>Goṣṭi</i> ... $\frac{1}{2}$		42	The whole arm ... 40	
16	Nose (width at base) 2		43	Upper arm ... 20	
17	„ height ... $1\frac{1}{2}$		44	Fore arm ... 16	
18	Nostril ... $\frac{1}{2}$		45	Palm (wrist to the m. finger up) ... 12	
19	<i>Nāsāvamśa</i> ... $\frac{1}{2}$		46	Middle arm (circumference) ... 28	
20	Space between 2 eyes 1		47	Palm (length without the fingers) 7	
21	Eye (length) ... 4		48	„ width ... 5	
22	„ (width) ... 2		49	Middle finger ... 5	
23	<i>Netrakṣa</i> ... 3		50	Index finger $\frac{1}{2}$ <i>parva</i> less than above.	
24	Pupil ... $\frac{1}{2}$		51	Ring finger $\frac{1}{2}$ añ. less than above.	
25	Head (height) ... 4		52	Little finger $\frac{1}{2}$ añ. less than above.	
	Space between				
26	2 near ends of the brows ... $1\frac{1}{2}$				
27	<i>Bhrūrekṣā</i> ... 4				

No.	Name of the Part measured	अं.	In Chinese.	No.	Name of the Part measured	अं.	In Chinese.
53	Space between thumb and the wrist.	4		70	Thigh	... 25	
54	Space between thumb and the index finger.	3		71	Thigh (middle width)	12	
55	Space between the wrist and the little finger.	5		72	Thigh (circumference)	36	
56	Circumference of the palm.	12		73	Calf (?)	... 4	32
57	Space between the ... neck and the chest.	12½		74	Knee-cap	... 3	
58	Space between the ... armpit and the breast.	6		75	<i>Gulphaka</i>	... 2	
59	Height from that to the shoulders.	9		76	Foreleg middle	... 25	
60	Width of the chest...	25		77	Foreleg (circumference)	21	
61	Chest (circumference)	75		78	The width from the... ends of the <i>gulpha</i> .	2	
62	Between chest and ... the navel.	16		79	The width from the... ends of the <i>Gulpha</i> , below.	4	
63	Navel	... 1		80	The distance between the 2 feet in standing images.	3	
64	Torso (circumference round the navel).	46	48	81	Feet (length)	... 12	
65	Waist (width)	... 18		82	,, (width)	... 6	
66	Space between navel and penis.	12½		83	Feet (side width)	... 2	
67	Penis	... 6½		84	<i>Pārṇī</i>	... 4	
68	Testes (width)	... 5		85	Toe-nails	½ <i>parva</i>	
69	Testes (length)	... 4		86	Big toe (length)	... 3	
				87	Second toe	... 3	
				88	Toes (height)	... 1	
				89	Big toe (height)	... 1½	

N.B.—Wherever, the Chinese version tallies with the Sanskrit original, the measurement is not again put down in the 2nd column. For omissions in the Chinese rendering, see the body of the Text.



APPENDIX B

(Actual measurements of some Buddha images in the Peshawar, Lahore and Calcutta Museums.)

While I was engaged in the work of editing this text, I thought it would be interesting to compare the actual measurements of some of the well-preserved Buddha images of different periods in the collection of the several Government museums in northern India, with the corresponding ones laid down in this text. I wanted to see how far the actual practice of the artists of the different art-centres tallied with the evidence of the texts, certainly compiled at a period later than the age of many of these sculptures. The results of my observations, I append below* :—

Gandhāra : During my short stay at Peshawar, I could only measure the broad outlines like the length and breadth of the face of the image, the middle digit of its medius and the whole height of the figure (wherever it was a standing one). I work out the *tāla* lengths of the image in each case.

Peshawar Museum

1. Exhibit no. 1878 :—Standing Buddha.

The length of the face	...	117 mm.
The breadth „ „	...	117 mm.
The whole height (including the <i>uṣṇīṣa</i>)	...	980 mm.

* I am indebted to Mr. Tarakchandra Das, M.A., of the Anthropology department of the Calcutta University, for showing me the correct use of the anthropometric instruments with which I took down the measurements. I am also thankful to the respective Curators of the museums, who gave me every facility in my first hand study of the Buddha images. Special mention, however, need be made here of Mr. M. Dilwarkhan and Mr. Monindra Gupta, Curators of Peshawar and Taxila museums respectively. Lastly, I cannot sufficiently expressed my gratitude to the late Rai Bahadur Pundit Radhakrishna of Mathurā for his kind help to me in many ways, during my stay at Mathurā.

[No measurement of the *aṅgula* of the image could be taken, on account of the fingers being damaged. But, calculating on the basis of the *dehalabdha aṅgula* unit, we arrive at the following interesting conclusion in this case :

$$\begin{aligned} 980 \div 120 &= 8.16 \text{ (deha-l° aṅgula unit)} \\ 8.16 \times 13.5 \text{ (Sārdhatrayodaśimātrāmukha)} \\ &= 110 \text{ (decimal places left out).} \end{aligned}$$

The length and breadth of the face, as laid down above, is 117mm.]

2. Exhibit no. 1425 :—Standing Buddha (hands broken).

The length of the face	114 mm.
The breadth „ „	104 mm.
The whole height (including the uṣ.)	984 mm.

[Calculating on the above basis, we find

$$\begin{aligned} 984 \div 120 &= 8.2 \text{ (dehalabdha aṅgula unit)} \\ 8.2 \times 13.5 &= 110.7 \text{ (the length of the face).} \end{aligned}$$

Here the difference of 3.3 mm. is immaterial. But the length and breadth of the face are not equal. However, our text only gives us the measurement of the length of the face, remaining silent about its breadth. But as we have seen in our notes that according to Varāhamihira, the length and the breadth of the face of images in general should be equal, measuring 12 *aṅgula* units only.]

3. Exhibit no. 1876 :—Standing Buddha.

The length of the face	114 mm.
The breadth „ „	112 mm.
The whole height (with uṣ.)	968 mm.

$$\begin{aligned} \therefore 968 \div 120 &= 8.06 \text{ (deha-l° aṅg. unit)} \\ 8.06 \times 13.5 &= 108.81 \text{ (the length of the face).} \end{aligned}$$

The difference here is 5.19 mm. ; the correct proportion is not maintained here.]

4. Exhibit no. 1931 :—Standing Buddha.

The length of the face 180 mm.
The breadth „ „ 128 mm.
The whole height with uṣ. 1165 mm.

$$[\therefore 1165 \div 120 = 9\cdot7 \text{ (deha-l° añ. unit)}]$$

$$9\cdot7 \times 13\cdot5 = 130\cdot95 \text{ (the length of the face).}$$

Curiously enough, there is the closest approximation here, in the actual face-length and that arrived at from calculation on the basis of our text.]

5. Exhibit No. 1939—Standing Buddha from Salātura (now called Lahore), the home of Pāṇini in the district of Peshawar :

The length of the face 170 mm.
The breadth of the face 158 mm.
Height with uṣ. 1600 mm.

$$\therefore 1600 \div 120 = 13\cdot3 \text{ (deha-l° añ. unit)}$$

$$13\cdot3 \times 13\cdot5 = 179\cdot55 \text{ (the length of the face).}$$

The difference, here, is 9·55 mm.

6. Exhibit No. 239—Sahri Bahlol 1907 standing Buddha :

The length of the face 156 mm.
The breadth of the face 138 mm.
Height with uṣ. 1355 mm.

$$\therefore 1355 \div 120 = 11\cdot29 \text{ (deha-l° añ. unit)}$$

$$11\cdot29 \times 13\cdot5 = 152\cdot41 \text{ (the length of the face).}$$

Thus, the difference, here, is 3·59 mm., which is not much at all. Hargreaves describes this image as a delicately featured one and as one of the best sculptures in the Museum.

7. Exhibit No. 1430—Standing Buddha :

The length of the face 142 mm.
The breadth of the face 138 mm.
Full height with uṣ. 1220 mm.

$$\therefore 1220 \div 120 = 10\cdot16 \text{ (deha-l° añ. unit).}$$

$$10\cdot16 \times 13\cdot5 = 137\cdot16 \text{ mm. (the length of the face).}$$

The difference is 6 mm.

8. Exhibit No. 1446—a magnificent colossal standing image from Sahri Bahlol. On account of the huge size, the anthropometric instruments were of no use in measuring it ; I took down the measurement carefully with an ordinary measuring tape and arrived at the following figures :

Length of the face 10½ inches (262·5 mm.)
Breadth of the face 9 ,, (237·5 mm.)
Full height with us 90 ,, (22·5 cm.)
The middle digit of the medius 1¼ ,, (31·25 mm.)
∴ $90'' \div 120 = \frac{3}{4}''$ (<i>deha-l° añ.</i> unit).	
$\frac{3}{4}'' \times 13·5 = 10·125''$ (the length of the face) (253·125 mm.)	


The difference is here $\frac{3}{8}$ th of an inch. It should be observed here, however, that the *aṅgula* of the image, *i.e.*, the breadth-measurement of the middle digit of its medius is much in excess above the *dehalabdha aṅgula* unit and calculation on the basis of the former will not give us satisfactory results at all. It seems that the *deha-l° añ.* *i.e.*, the *mātrāṅgula* was the unit which was adopted by these image-makers in the measurement of the images. The correct explanation of the *svenāṅguli-pramāṇena* is to be found here.

9. Exhibit No. 1447—Colossal standing Buddha, from Sahri-Bahlol :

The length of the face 10 inches (250 mm.)
The breadth of the face 9 ,, (225 mm.)
Full height with us. 84 ,, (21· cm.)
Its own <i>aṅgula</i> 1 ,, (25 mm.)
∴ $84'' \div 120 = 7''$ (<i>deha-l° añ.</i> unit.)	
$7'' \times 13·5 = 9·45''$ (length of the face) (236·25 mm.)	

The difference is about half an inch. The same remarks as are offered in the case of the last big image about its own *aṅgula* also apply to it.

A few more Buddhas in the Peshawar Museum were also measured by me ; but on account of their being seated ones, their full height could not be ascertained and in its absence, the






PLATE 2.

dehalabdhā aṅgula unit in their case, could not be arrived at. Still, I give below the measurements of the face and the middle digit of the medius of two seated Buddha figures, in order to prove that the latter, for all practical purposes, was not used by the artist as the basis of calculation.

10. Exhibit No. 1928—Seated Buddha :

The length of the face	98 mm.
The breadth „ „	95 mm.
<i>Aṅgula</i> (middle digit of the medius)	9 mm.

Thus, if we multiply 9 by 13·5, we arrive at 121·5 mm. which is much more in excess than the actual face-length.

11. Exhibit No. 1160—Seated Buddha.

The length of the face	116 mm.
The breadth „ „	115 mm.
<i>Aṅgula</i>	13 mm.

Thus, $13 \times 13 \cdot 5 = 175 \cdot 5$ which could never be the face-length of this figure.

The practice of the indigenous artists of the early Mathurā school, could not be tested, on account of the fact that no well-preserved standing figure of Buddha of the early Kuṣāṇ period was available. The fine Buddha image of Kaṭrā, in a perfect state of preservation, is, unfortunately, not a standing one and so could not be utilised for this purpose. The standing Buddha of the Kuṣāṇ period—No. A4 in the Mathurā Museum—has lost both its feet and the pedestal ; the huge size and damaged condition of Bhikṣu Bala's Buddhas stood in the way of their supplying us with much useful data of this character. However, two Buddha images in red sand-stone of the Gupta period, in the collection of the Mathurā and Calcutta Museums, were measured by me and their details are given below :—

12. Mathurā Museum, No. A5—beautifully carved image of a standing Buddha :

The length of the face	185 mm.
The breadth	„	...	165 mm.
Full height with <i>uṣṇīṣa</i>	1800 mm.
The length of the <i>uṣṇīṣa</i>	50 mm.
„ „ forehead	61 mm.
„ „ nose	61 mm.
„ „ chin	62 mm.
„ „ eye	68 mm.
The width „ „	28 mm.
„ „ upper lid	16 mm.
The open extension of the eye	9 mm.
The length of the mouth	57 mm.
The width „ „ (including the upper and lower lips)	22·5 mm.
<i>Goṣṭhī</i> (width)	9 mm.
The width of the middle digit of the medius	20 mm.

Thus, $1800 \div 120 = 15$ mm. (*deha-ī^o añ.* unit); $15 \times 13\cdot5 = 202\cdot5$ mm. (which is much in excess compared with the actual face-length ; but if we multiply 15 by 12·5, as the Tibetan and Chinese versions of our text lay down, then the worked-out face-length is 187·5 mm. which closely approximates the actual measurement. The difference in the measurements of the length and breadth of the face should be noted; according to the *Drāviḍa māna* as laid down by Nagnajit, the latter should be 2 *añ.* less than the former. Here, however, the difference is about one and a half *aṅgulas* only).

Referring to our table No. V and calculating on the basis of the *dehalabdha aṅgula* unit in this case, we find a remarkable unanimity between our text and the actual measurements in the case of those of the forehead, nose, chin, eye-length, mouth-length, *goṣṭhī*, etc., with very slight difference, here and there.

13. Indian Museum—M.13—Standing Buddha from Mathurā (fingers broken) :

The length of the face	151 mm.
The full height	1432 "
* <i>Uṣṇiṣā</i>	40 "
* Forehead	52 "
* Chin	48 "
Lower lip	10 "
* Mouth (length)	48 "
* Upper lip	7 "
* <i>Goṣṭhī</i>	6 "
Nose (its width at the base)	32 "
* Nostril	7 "
* Eye (length)	47 "
Eye socket	24 "
<i>Bhrūrekṣā</i>	66 "
Head (height)	60 "
Ear (breadth)	39 "
Head (front—from one ear to the other)	140 "
Head (periphery)	560 "
* Neck (height)	46 "
* „ (width)	105 "
* Arm (whole length)	470 "
Upper arm	280 "
* Fore arm	190 "
The width of the palm	80 "
Distance between the neck and the chest	122 "
* The width of the chest	290 "
* The distance between the chest and the navel	160 "
Navel	15 "
* The width of the waist	210 "
* Fore leg	300 "
* The width of the feet	68 "

No other measurements could be taken, on account of damages in the sculpture, the difficulty in fixing the points and the relievo character of the image.

Here, $1432 \text{ mm.} \div 120 = 11.93 \text{ mm. (deha-t' an. unit)}$. But, if we multiply 11.93 by 13.5, we find that the worked out face

length will be 161·055 ; on the other hand, if we accept the Tibetan and Chinese versions of our text as authority, then the latter will be 149·125 which is in close approximation with the actual face-length.

The measurements of the bodily sections marked with asterisks above were found on calculation; in close approximation with those of the corresponding ones, referred to in our table No. V ; it will be seen that in a majority of cases, the textual and actual measurements closely tallied with each other.

14. Indian Museum—S.15. Standing Buddha from Sarnath :

The length of the face	138 mm.
The breadth	132 ..
Full height with <i>uṣṇīṣa</i>	1277 ..
The width of the middle digit of the medius	11 ..
Thus, $1277 \div 120 = 10\cdot64$ mm. (<i>deha-l° añ. unit</i>).			
$10\cdot64 \times 13\cdot5 = 143\cdot64$ mm.			
or $10\cdot64 \times 12\cdot5 = 133$ mm.			

In either case, the difference between the actual face-length and the worked-out ones, is about 5 mm. But, if we accept the Chinese and Tibetan versions as our authority, then the breadth of the face also very closely approximates the calculated length.

15. Sarnath Museum—22.E. Buddha standing (Gupta period) :

The length of the face	192 mm.
Full height (with <i>uṣṇīṣa</i>)	1788 ..
The width of the middle digit of the medius	22 ..
Now, $1788 \div 120 = 14\cdot9$ mm. (<i>deha-l° añ. unit</i>).			
$14\cdot9 \times 13\cdot5 = 191\cdot15$ mm.			

Here, we find a remarkable coincidence between the text and the image.

16. Indian Museum—Kr. 13: Buddha standing, with Sakra and Brahmā, one on either side of him (Anderson's

Catalogue, Pt. II, p. 76 :—Buddha's descent from *Trayaś-trimśa* heaven at Sankisa) Pāla period :

The length of the face	118 mm.
Full height with <i>uṣṇīṣa</i>	1045 mm.
The width of the middle digit of the medius	10 mm.
∴ 1045 ÷ 120 = 8·7 mm. (<i>dēha-l° aṅ.</i> unit).			
8·7 × 13·5 = 117·45			

Here also, the approximation between the text and the actual image is a remarkably close one. We notice below, a few details of measurement of this image :—

* <i>Uṣṇīṣa</i>	... 25 mm.	Palm (from the wrist	125 mm.
*Forehead	... 41 mm.	to the end of the middle	
*Nose	... 41 mm.	finger-tip)	
Nose to chin	... 34 mm.	Palm (length without	75 mm.
Mouth (length)	... 44 mm.	the fingers)	
* <i>Goṣṭhi</i>	... 6 mm.	Palm (width)	... 55 mm.
*Eye (length)	... 36 mm.	Middle finger (length)	... 55 mm.
Socket	... 33 mm.	Index ,, ,,	... 50 mm.
<i>Bhūrūrekhā</i>	... 49 mm.	Ring ,, ,,	... 48 mm.
Ear (breadth)	... 26 mm.	Little ,, ,,	... 41 mm.
*Ear-lobes	... 52 mm.	Distance bet. the neck	106 mm.
Head (front)	... 128 mm.	and the chest	
*Neck (height)	... 39 mm.	The width of the chest	... 265 mm.
,, (width)	... 91 mm.	*Distance bet. the chest	121 mm.
*Whole arm	... 365 mm.	and the navel	
Upper arm	... 214 mm.	Fore leg	... 198 mm.
*Fore arm	... 151 mm.	*Big toe (length)	... 27 mm.

Those marked with asterisks, fairly come up to the standard laid down in the texts ; but discrepancies in this case are many. The image, is not a very well-executed one ; the unusual width of the mouth and the snubness of the chin are quite apparent in the figure and these, as we see, are not according to the correct proportions. There is no doubt about the fact that these canons in the hands of a skilful artist did never stand in the way of their turning out well-proportioned and beautiful

images ; for what are these rules ? They are nothing but the results of the accumulated experience of generations of image-makers, skilful in wielding their chisel. The compilation of these canons had their practical utility ; and so in every authoritative iconographic text, they find a very prominent place.

One other point, extremely interesting from the iconometric point of view, is to be specially noticed here. This detailed iconometric study of the 16 Buddha images, has convinced me that the unit of measurement adopted by the image-makers, was in variably the *deha-labdha āṅgula* principally and was neither the width of the middle digit of the medius nor a *mānāṅgula* (i.e., 8 *yavas*—the middle measurement of 8 medium sized *yavas*, placed side by side is according to my experiment, 25 mm.—which never could have served as the measuring unit of any of the images). I have already referred at length in my note on *svenāṅgulimānena*, to the very interesting observation of Utpala, the commentator of Varāhamihira, on the manner in which this unit was arrived at by the sculptor or wood-carver, and that was certainly the really practical way of ascertaining the unit, on the basis of which, the various *pramāṇas*, *unmānas*, and *upamānas* of particular images were measured out. The *Vaikhāṇasāgama* (Ch. 22) tells us: **वेरोक्षेधं तत्तालवशेन विभज्यैकांशं देहलब्धङ्गुलं तदष्टांशं यवमिति**, i.e., one part (unit) arrived at by dividing the whole height of the image according to its *tāla* (by 10×12 , i.e., a ten *tāla* image is at first divided into 10 equal parts, and then each part again is subdivided into 12 equal parts) is a *deha-labdhāṅgula*; while $\frac{1}{8}$ th part of the latter is a *yava*; and this is practically the same thing as laid down in *Brhatsamhitā* as commented on by Utpala. So, *sva* or *svakīya* here, really refers to the image itself and not to the donor or sculptor; in some cases, however, the full height of the image might have been first arrived at on the basis of the width of the middle digit of the medius of either the sculptor or donor of the image; but that was on rare occasions when the images were life-size ones.

APPENDIX C

EXTRACTS FROM *Kriyā Samuccaya*.

(From the MSS. copy in the possession of Dr. P. C. Bagchi, M.A., D. Es. Lettres, Lecturer, Calcutta University, with his kind permission.)

भगवता यदेवोक्तं बुद्धाच्च(?)तिक्ततोहलं(?) लक्षणं बुद्धमूर्त्तिना तदेवात्रापि लिख्यते सर्वलक्षणसम्पूर्णा प्रतिमा सुखदायिका तद्विहीना यदा सा स्यादति-
दुःखप्रदायिका¹ किन्तत्सुखं तदाह यावन्तः परमाणवोभगवस्तु येषु विम्बसु वा

ततः सम्यक्संबुद्धानां महावज्रधराणाञ्च दैवाणकायस्य वा(हु)दय पार्श्व-
प्रसारित-व्यामोपि किं प्रमाणं स्वकीयाङ्गुलेन सार्द्धद्वादशाङ्गुलस्तालेन पञ्चविंश-
त्यधिकशताङ्गुल²लोचनादि देवौ(नाम्) ना (द्वा)दशाङ्गुलस्तालस्तेन नवतालेनाष्टोत्तर-
शताङ्गुलायामो व्यायामश्च । बोधिसत्वानाञ्च द्वादशाङ्गुले दशतालकमेव । खर्व-
लम्बोदल(र)क्रोधानाञ्च षण्ण(स)वत्यङ्गुलमष्टतालेन ललितक्रोधानान्तु दशतालेन
विंशत्युत्तरशताङ्गुलायामव्यायामश्च सर्वाङ्गोपाशे(ङ्गा)दिक् ज्ञातव्यं ।

(मातुः) शास्त्रधर्मदेशनागमनसमये शालि(र)पुत्रो भगवन्तमेतदवोचत्,
भगवन् भगवता विना आद्वैः कुलपुत्रैः कुलदुहितृभिश्च कथं प्रतिपत्तव्यं ।
भगवाह, शारिपुत्र मयिगते परिनिर्वृते वा न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलं कायं कर्तव्यं ।
यावद्दग्रामं तावत्कायं³ यावत्कायं तावद्दग्रामं । पूजासत्कारार्थं प्रतिमा
कर्तव्या । सर्वाङ्गोपाङ्गावयवस्थूल्य-लावण्यलालित्यसलीलत्वम् । समोत्सदमहाहस्तः
कृत्राकारशिरःस्कन्धां सुसंस्थितोष्णीषत्वादि सुसंस्थानात् तत्रायामविस्तारोत्प्रे-
सन्धिबन्धनिर्गमैः । प्रमाणं[बुद्धमूर्त्तिनां] बोधिसत्वानाञ्चेति वचनात् । तत्र
लावण्यं स्निग्धचर्मता लालित्यं मनोहरता सलीलत्वं त्रिभङ्गत्वादिगुणेन समोसदेति
समावयवाः उत्सदा उच्छ्रया-उन्नताञ्चेति यथायाः (?) कतमे पादद्वयं हस्तद्वयं
स्कन्धद्वयं ग्रीवा चेति अपरं प्रसिद्ध(?)मेव किञ्चिदुन्नतिरुच्छेधः । तत्र चतुरङ्गुलमुष्णीषं

¹ दातदुःखप्रदायिका in the MSS. The same idea is expressed in the *Sukranītisāra*.

² स्थालतपथ्यतेमूर्त्तिधकशभाङ्गुल in the MSS. For *tāla* and *āṅgula*, see my note above.

³ य वज्रसत्तावत् कार्य in the MSS.

केशस्थानञ्च तथैव ललाटनासिकाधश्चिबुकान्तं चतुर्यवाधिकचतुरङ्गुलमितेनार्द्ध-
त्रयोदशमात्रासुखभागः⁴ । चिबुकं द्वाङ्गुलं भवेत् आयामनिर्गमाभ्याञ्चैव चतुरङ्गुल-
मिष्यते । चतुरङ्गुली कपोली कर्णमूलादिनिर्गतौ चक्षुरधश्चर्मणोऽधोभागो हनुः
स्यात् द्वा(त्रा?)ङ्गुलीत्सेधो विस्तारात् द्वाङ्गुलश्च सः बोधिसत्वाये(नां) क्षयाधिकः (?)
परिपूर्णः स्यात् महासिंहहनुर्यथा संबुद्धमहावज्रधराणां किञ्चिदुन्नत इत्यर्थः ।
क्रोधानां तु चिपिटोविस्ताराधिकं । अधरोद्वाङ्गुलायामनिर्गमोत्सेधमात्रिकः
अङ्गुल्यद्वितीयभागो मात्रिकः इति अधरमध्यं विस्वह(फ)लवत् एकाङ्गुले सृक्कणी
चतुरङ्गुलायामं चक्रं (वक्त्रं) यथोत्पादोनि(वि)न्यासश्च चत्वारिंशदुदशनानां राज-
दन्तादिक्रमेण उत्तरीष्ठोऽङ्गुलार्द्धश्चतुर्यवो निर्गमोत्सेधभ्यां नासाग्राधाष्टाङ्गुल
त्रिभागाप्रणालाकारा श्मश्रूमध्या गोधि(चि) नासा द्वाङ्गुलविस्तारा सार्द्धाङ्गुलीन्नत
बुद्धानां किञ्चिदधिका ।

अतिक्रोधानां किञ्चिच्चिपिटो पार्श्वनिर्गता, अर्द्धाङ्गुलसमेवृत्ते श्रोतसी तस्या
नासावंशो नासाग्रमवक्रो विस्तारात् अर्द्धाङ्गुलः । चतुरङ्गुलश्चक्षुकोशः तन्मध्य-
मेकाङ्गुलं विस्तारात् । मध्याङ्गुलं⁵ ; भुवोरधस्तादभ्याधः पर्यन्तं त्र्यङ्गुलं ।
चक्षुषो चतुरे (?)अन्तरं नासामूलमेकाङ्गुलं भ्रूः चतुरङ्गुलायता चापाकारा
अर्द्धाङ्गुल विस्तारामध्यं⁶ वज्रधरस्य

क्रोधानान्तु कुटिला बुद्धानां ध्यानदृष्टि(ष्टी)नां द्वियवविस्तारा(रा)त् द्वाधिक-
विंशत्यङ्गुलायामाच्चापाकारं बोधिसत्वानान्तु चतुर्यवविस्तारात् विंशतियवायामात्
उत्पलं सर्वासां शृङ्गारस्त्रीणां अष्टादशयवायामेन षट्यवविस्तारान्तत्सोदराकारं
चतुर्यवकरवीरं नासासमीपं नेत्रान्तं अपरनेत्रान्तोपाङ्गुलश्चतुर्यवः अङ्गुलश्चक्षुर्मणिः
पिटकेन(?) द्वियवोन्नतः कालिकासतारका⁷ पञ्चयवप्रमाणा सृक्कणोत्सृजसमादृष्टि

⁴ Here, the face length consisting of $13\frac{1}{2}$ *dehalabdha angula* units is very sensibly subdivided into 3 equal parts, viz., the forehead, the nose and from below the nose up to the end of the chin, each measuring 4 *dehāṅgūlas* and 4 *yavas* (i.e., $4\frac{1}{2}$ *dehāṅgula* units).

⁵ The sense is not clear here; there may be some copyist's mistakes. Perhaps, this measurement refers to the space between the two inner ends of the eyes; in our original text it is also one *angula*.

⁶ This $\frac{1}{2}$ *angula* is most likely the measurement of the middle-width of the open space of the eyes; apparently there is no mention of this in our original text. The *Kriyāsamuccaya* refers to three types of eyes of three classes of divinities, viz., *Buddha*, *Bodhisattva* and *Buddhasaktis*.

⁷ सातिरिका in the MSS.

मध्यपुत्तलिका सार्द्धाङ्गुला चैव पञ्चभागेन विस्तारिणैकाङ्गुलं तारा त्रिभागिकी अङ्गुलस्य चतुर्थांशः प्रकाशितोऽक्षिपुत्रकः पञ्चपत्राकृति नेत्रकोषो(शो)ऽङ्गुलत्रयं करवीरसमं सूत्रं नासिकापुटस्य तारासमं चिबुकं सृक्कणी तथा भ्रुवोर्मध्यमर्द्धाङ्गुलं तत्रैवोर्णा एकाङ्गुला पूर्णचन्द्रनिभा नासा उष्णीषसमं सूत्रं भ्रुवोरिखासमौ कर्णौ आयामिन चतुरङ्गुली द्व्यङ्गुलविस्तारी तत्पत्रं चतुर्यवं तयोरूर्ध्वपत्रं चतुर्यवं तत् सूचेनैकाङ्गुलं विलं चतुर्यवं कपोलकर्णच्छिद्रयोर्मध्ये कर्णावर्त्तः कलिकाकारोऽद्वियवः कर्णलता चतुरङ्गुली दीर्घतः स्थूला यथाशोभनं पूर्वसुष्णीषादि ग्रीवापर्यन्तं चतुर्यवाधिक-विंशत्यङ्गुलं सुत्का(?)—इदानीं ग्रीवादिगुल्फाधःपर्यन्तस्य विभागः क्रियते ग्रीवा चतुरङ्गुला ग्रीवातो हृदयसार्द्धद्वादशाङ्गुलं हृदयान्नाभिपर्यन्तं तथा नाभेरागुह्यं सार्द्धद्वादशाङ्गुलं उरुः पञ्चविंशत्यङ्गुलं जंघापि तथा ग(?) जानुः षडङ्गुलं द्व्यङ्गुली गुल्फः गुल्फादधश्चतुरङ्गुलमेति सम्यक्संबुडवज्रधरबोधिसत्त्वादीनां दशतालस्य कथितो विभागः ।

अन्येषां तु यथायोगमुन्येयं (उन्मानं ?) यथाशोभं शिरोमणिः विमलः कार्यः उष्णीषमध्यस्थीकृत्य द्वादशाङ्गुलं जटामुकुटं वज्रधरस्य वीराणां बोधिसत्त्वानामष्टाङ्गुलं जटाजुटं मुकुटं चेतिविशेषः दशाङ्गुलमिति केचित् उष्णीषाधोवेष्टनेन द्वादशाङ्गुलं ललाटोपरिच्छृत्वाकारं नीलदक्षिणावर्त्तमूर्ध्वजं उन्नतमस्तकं कर्णसंमुखपृष्ठवेष्टनेन द्वात्रिंशदङ्गुलं मस्तकं ग्रीवा अष्टाङ्गुलविस्तारा तस्य वेष्टनं चतुर्विंशत्यङ्गुलं ग्रीवाया अष्टाङ्गुलं हित्वा कर्णसमीपे चतुरङ्गुलेन सह द्वादशाङ्गुलस्कन्धो दृत्तः (वृत्तः) स्यात्तच्छणान्वितः क्षयताल(र)हितस्कन्धात् कफोणेरूर्ध्वं विंशत्यङ्गुली बाहुः कफोणि-रेकाङ्गुला कफोणेरधस्तान्मणिबन्धादूर्ध्वं प्रबाहुः षोडशाङ्गुलः एकाङ्गुली मणिबन्धः मणिबन्धादधोमध्याङ्गुलाग्रपर्यन्तं द्वादशाङ्गुली हस्तः एव पञ्चाशदङ्गुलं बाहोर्मध्यवेष्टनं विंशत्यङ्गुलम् उपवाहोर्मध्यवेष्टनं षोडशाङ्गुलं मणिबन्धवेष्टनं द्वादशाङ्गुलं मणिबन्धात् सप्ताङ्गुलकरतरं (लं) मध्याङ्गुली पञ्चमात्रा तस्याः पर्वार्द्धाणां प्रदेशिनी अनामिका तत्समा पर्वोना कनीयसी सर्वा अङ्गुलयस्त्रिपर्व्याः पर्वार्द्धेन नखास्तासां मणिबन्धा-च्चतुरङ्गुलमङ्गुलनखाग्रं⁸(?) या(?) चतुरङ्गुलीऽङ्गुष्ठः द्विपर्व्यः पर्वार्द्धेन नखः

⁸ त्यक्तानखाग्रं in the MSS. I am doubtful about my emendation. In the original text, the measurement of the space length between the wrist and the bottom of the thumb is 4 *angulas*. We can however arrange the words here in this manner : मणिबन्धाच्चतुरङ्गुलमङ्गुलनखाग्रं ; नखाग्रया (सार्द्धं) चतुरङ्गुलीऽङ्गुष्ठः । This emendation, however, correctly fits in with our original text.

अङ्गुष्ठवेष्टनेन चतुरङ्गुलः अङ्गुष्ठप्रदेशिन्योरन्तरं अ(त्र)ङ्गुलं मणिवन्धात् कनीयसी-
मूलपर्यन्तं पञ्चाङ्गुलं स्कन्धात् कक्षपर्यन्तं नवाङ्गुलं कक्षात् स्तनं यावत् षडङ्गुलं
उलः(रः) पृष्ठयोर्वेष्टनं षट्पञ्चाशदङ्गुलं स्तनयोर्मध्यं सार्द्धद्वादशाङ्गुलं स्तननाभ्योर्मध्यं
षोडशाङ्गुलं नाभिमाल(र)भ्य पृष्ठेन सनाभिं यावत् षट्चत्वारिंशदङ्गुलं नाभिर्निम्नतया
(?) एकाङ्गुलं परिणाहं च तथा विस्तारेणाष्टादशाङ्गुला कटिः हि(स्फि)चौ
चतुरङ्गुली विस्तारायामी उरुमूलयोर्मध्यं द्वादशाङ्गुलं वेष्टनेन त्रिगुणं तयोर्मध्ये
आयामेन पञ्चाङ्गुली विस्तारेण चतुरङ्गुली अण्डकोषौ तदुपरि द्वाङ्गुलविस्तारेण
गुह्यदैर्घ्येण ह्रियवाधिकषडङ्गुलं उरुमध्यवेष्टनेन द्वात्रिंशदङ्गुलं जानुवेष्टनमष्टा-
विंशत्यङ्गुलं⁹ जंघामध्यवेष्टनं चतुर्विंशत्यङ्गुलं जंघाधौ वेष्टनमेकविंशत्यङ्गुलं
पादग्रन्येरधः पाष्णीचतुरङ्गुले अधजङ्घतः षडङ्गुले विर्यक(तिर्यग्)विस्ताराच्च
परिणाहेनाष्टादशाङ्गुले गुल्फात् परत्रोऽङ्गुष्ठनखाग्रं यावत् पादौ द्वादशाङ्गुली
विस्तारेण षडङ्गुली अधजङ्घेन द्वाङ्गुलविस्तारौ पादयोः पाश्वर्यौ ; पादाङ्गुलयः पञ्च
हि हि पर्व्याः¹⁰ तासामग्रे पर्वर्जिन नखाः पादाङ्गुष्ठः पञ्चाङ्गुलः परिणाहेन दैर्घ्येण¹¹
अ(त्र)ङ्गुलः तत्समा प्रदेशिनो तस्याः सार्द्धयवोना (सार्द्धपर्व्याना ?) मध्यमा
तस्या अष्टमभागो नोनानामिका¹² तस्या अप्यष्टमभागोना कनीयसी अङ्गुलयः
एकाङ्गुलोन्नताः अङ्गुष्ठायौ सार्द्धाङ्गुलोन्नतौ वहिरुपरिपादौ कूर्मपृष्ठसमी अधस्ता-
च्चक्रादिभिरलङ्घ्यतौ कुक्कुटाण्डन्तिलाकारं चतुरस्रञ्च मण्डलं सर्वसामान्यलिङ्गानां
मुखाकृतिः चतुर्विधा संबुद्धानां महावज्रधराणाञ्च मुखं कुक्कुटाण्डाकारं
लोचना(दि)देवकन्यानां तिलविलम्बाकारं(?) मैत्रेयादि महाबोधिसत्वानां महा-
वज्रधरवत् मुखं सर्वलम्बोदरक्रोधानां मण्डलाकारं वृत्तमुखं ललितक्रोधानां तु
बोधिसत्ववत् प्रेतादीनां तु चतुरस्रमुखं लावण्यदर्शनं मुखद्वयं चतुरस्रं मण्डलं
मुखद्वयं विह्वताकारं समादृष्टिं प्रसन्नास्य सौम्यनिम्नावलोकनेनोर्ध्वनन्देत्युक्ते(?)ऽधः
कर्त्तव्ये सर्वदर्शिनामिति ।¹³

⁹ जानुवेष्टनमष्टाद्विंशत्यङ्गुलं in the MSS.

¹⁰ यवाः in the MSS.

¹¹ दक्षीण in the MSS.

¹² अङ्गुष्ठमभागो नोनानामिका in the MSS.

¹³ Here occur about 15 lines about the images of Locanā, Srisambara, Vajravārāhi, Khaṇḍārōhā, Dākini, Lāmā, Viravireśwari, Kakmi(?), Indra, Isāna, Upendra, Pitāmaha, Vemacitri, Nirṛti, Kucera, Anala, Grahas, Sūrya, Rāhu, Ketu, Heramba. As these details are very meagre and as they have no connection with the Buddha images, they have been left out.

तत्र संबुद्धाः करुणाशान्तरसोपेताः वज्रधरमुख सव(र्व)स(श)रीरं नवरसरसाविष्टं
 बोधिसत्वादयस्तु शृङ्गाररषि(सि)का इति प्रस्तार(व): ४ कथितः तस्यामूर्त्ते
 लक्षणं च ज्ञानं च ननि (लक्षणानुव्यञ्जनानि) कथ्यते—तद्यथा सहस्रारचक्राङ्कित
 पाणिपादतलता १ कूर्मवत् सुप्रतिष्ठितपादता २ राजहंसवज्जानानवन्नाङ्गुलिपाणि-
 पादनात् (राजहंसवज्जालानवन्नाङ्गुलिपाणिपादता) ३ मृदुतरुणहस्तपादता ४
 सु(स)मुच्छ्रितहस्तद्वयपादद्वयस्तम्ब (स्तम्भ)द्वयग्रीवाप्रदेशेत्वात् (ग्रीवाप्रमृतीनां)
 समोच्छ्रद(समोत्सद)गात्रता ५ दीर्घाङ्गुलिता ६ आपनयाता ७ वृहद्वज्रागत्रता
 (वृहत्तमदुगात्रता) ८ उच्छ्रष्ट(ग)पादता ९ जङ्घाङ्गु(जङ्घाङ्ग)रोमता १० पेण्येजघता ११
 प(पा)दुरुवाङ्गुता(?) १२ कोशगतवस्तिगुह्यता १३ सुवर्णता १४ सूक्ष्मच्छविता १५
 प्रदक्षिणावर्त्त एकैकरोमता १६ उष्णीषाङ्कितमुखता १७ सिंहपूर्वाङ्किकायता १८
 सुसंवृत्तस्तम्भता १९ चित्तान्तराङ्गता (चित्तान्तरांसता) २० रसरसाग्रजिह्वक्षता
 (रसरसाग्रता) २१ न्यग्रोधपरिमण्डलता २२ उष्णीषशिरस्त(स्त)ता २३ प्रभ(भू)त-
 जिह्वता (प्रभूततनुजिह्वता) २४ ब्रह्मस्वरता २५ सिंहहनुता २६ शुक्ल(क्ल)दन्तता
 २७ समदन्तता चतुर्भारनिक्षन्तत्वाच्चतुर्दंष्ट्रा विहाय भगवतः २८ अविरलदन्तता २९
 चित्तान्तराङ्गदन्तता (चत्वारिंशदुदन्तता) ३० अभिनीलनेत्रता ३१ गोपक्षनेत्रता
 चेति ३२ द्वात्रिंशत्क्षणाणि ।¹⁴


व्यञ्जनानुच्यते¹⁵ ताम्रनखता १ स्निग्धनखता २ तुङ्गनखता ३ वृत्ताङ्गुलिता ४
 चिताङ्गुलिता ५ अपूर्वाङ्गुलिता (अनुपूर्वाङ्गुलिता) ६ स्व(सु)निगूढशिरस्त(?)ता ७
 निकुन्थि(निर्ग्रन्थि)शिरस्कता(शिरता) ८ गूढगुल्फता ९ अवियमयादतो
 (अविषमपादता) १० सिंहविक्रान्तगामिता ११ नागविक्रान्तगामिता १२ हंसवि-

¹⁴ Detailed lists of these 32 *Mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇas* occur in various Buddhist texts, both early and late ones, such as *Mahāpadāna* and *Lakkhana suttantas* of the *Dīghanikāya*, *Lalitavistara* and *Mahāvīyutpatti* among others. Some of these *lakṣaṇas* can be plastically and pictorially represented and these were certainly utilised by the early iconographers of the Buddha images, at a period when elaborate iconographic canons, like the present ones being edited here, were not in existence. In the main, the *Kriyāsamuccaya* list of 32 *lakṣaṇas*, tallies with the *Mahāvīyutpatti* list; but differences exist. Thus, one of the minor *lakṣaṇas*, viz., वृहद्वज्रागत्रता which is not present among the 32 in the latter, is put among the 32 major ones; again, some *lakṣaṇas* such as सूक्ष्मसुवर्णच्छविता and अभिनीलनेत्रगोपक्षा are split up. Again, two at least in this list are obscure, viz., आपनयाता and पादुरुवाङ्गुता ।

¹⁵ About the 80 minor signs, similar observation, as above, can be made. There are slight discrepancies here and there between our list and the list given in the *Mahāvīyutpatti*. Moreover, the total number of these lesser signs does not come up to 80; we find here 78 such mentioned, instead of 80.

क्रान्तगामिता १३ ऋषभविक्रान्तगामिता १४ प्रदक्षिणगामिता १५ चारुगामिता
 १६ अच(व)क्रगामिता १७ ऋजुगात्रता (वृत्तगात्रता) १८ सु(म्)ष्टगात्रता १८
 अनुपूर्वगात्रता २० शुचिगात्रता २१ मृदुगात्रता २२ विशुद्धगात्रता २३ परिपूर्ण-
 व्यञ्जनता २४ पृथुचारुश्मश्रुता (पृथुचारुमण्डलगात्रता) २५ विशुद्धमे(ने)-
 त्रता २६ कुमाल(र)गात्रता (सुकुमारगात्रता) २७ अदीनगात्रता २८ उत्-
 सदगात्रता २९ सुसंहनन(सुसंहत)गात्रता ३० सुविभक्ताङ्गप्रत्यङ्गता ३१ चि
 (वि)तिमिरशुद्धालोकता ३२ वृत्तकुक्षिता ३३ मृष्टकुक्षिता ३४ अभुङ्गकुक्षिता
 ३५ अक्षामकुक्षिता (क्षामोदरता) ३६ गम्भीरनाभिता ३७ प्रदक्षिणावर्त्तनाभिता
 ३८ समत्तायासादिकता (समन्तप्रासादिकता) ३९ शुचिसमुदाररता (शुचि-
 समाचारता) ४० व्यपगतिलंकालकालकगात्रता (व्यपगतिलंकालकगात्रता) ४१
 तूलसदृशसुकुमारपाणिता ४२ स्तिग्धपाणिलेखता ४३ आयतपाणिलेखता ४४
 नात्यायतवदनता ४५ विम्बप्रतिविम्बोपमौष्ठता (विम्बप्रतिविम्बदर्शनवदनता)
 ४६ मृदुजिह्वता ४७ तनुजिह्वता ४८ रक्तजिह्वता ४९ मेघगर्जिता (त) घोषता
 (गजगर्जितजीमूतघोषता) ५० मधुरचारुमञ्जुखल(र)ता ५१ वृत्तदंष्ट्रता ५२
 तीक्ष्णाद्रष्टता (तीक्ष्णदंष्ट्रता) ५३ शुक्त(क्त)दंष्ट्रता ५४ समद्रष्टता (समदंष्ट्रता) ५५
 चतुर्द्रष्टा (दंष्ट्रा)विधाय(?) [not in *Mahāvīyutpatti*] अनुपूर्वद्र(दं)ष्ट(ष्ट)ता
 ५६ तङ्क(तुङ्क)नासता ५७ शुचिनासता ५८ विशालनयनता ५९ चितपद्मता ६०
 सितसितकमलदल(सकल)नयनता ६१ आयतभ्रूता ६२ शुक्लभ्रूता (स्रक्ष्णभ्रूता)
 ६३ स्तिग्धभ्रूता ६४ समरोमभ्रूता ६५ पीनायतभुजता (पीनायतकर्णता) ६६
 समकर्णता ६७ अनुपहतकर्णेन्द्रियता ६८ अपरिस्नानललाटता (सुपरिणतललाटता)
 ६९ पृथुललता (पृथुललाटता) ७० सपरिपूर्णोत्तमाङ्गता (सुपरिपूर्णोत्तमाङ्गता) ७१
 अमरसदृशके(श)ता ७२ चितकेशता ७३ शुक्ल(स्रक्ष्ण)केशता ७४ असंलुदि(लि)-
 तकेशता ७५ अपरुषकेशता ७६ सुरभिकेशता ७७ शीवत्सखस्तिकनद्या(न्या)वर्त्त-
 क(ल)लितपाणिपादतलता चेष्टित(?) विविधपुण्योपचितकुशलमूलत्वात् पूर्व-
 पूर्वजन्मशु(सु) भगवतोऽशीतिव्यञ्जनान्युक्तानि धर्मशाखा(स्त्र)सूत्रान्तं चोक्तानि
 भग(व)तोऽशीतिलेख्यानुलक्षणाणि तत् यथा यश्च मञ्जुश्रीरशीतिव्यञ्जनानुप्रविष्टः
 पुण्यस्कन्धः तेनैव पुण्यस्कन्धेनानेककोटीनि पूनः(?) शतसहस्रगुणितेन तथागतस्य
 पाणिपादतले स्वेकं लक्षणं निष्यद्यते एवं प्रत्येकं लेख्यां सुलक्षणं भवति अशीति-
 लेखानुलक्षणानि तथागतस्य पाणिपादतले स्वभिनिष्यद्यते तद् यथा क्वत्तं ध्वजं
 श्रीवत्सं माला अङ्गुलिं मुकुटं गदा कुम्भं गजं हरं (ह्रिं ?) व्याघ्रं गरुडं मकलं(रं)

मत्स्यं कच्छपं मयूरं कलविङ्कजीवं(?) जीवकं चक्रवाकं शुक्रं हंसं कपोतं
 पर्वा(?) महोदधिः धेनुं गवयं(?) नागं ऋषभं पर्वतं विल्वपादं ऋक्षमृगं मणिरत्नं
 वरशंखं चक्रं धेनुः(?) श्वत् मिश्रैर्मिश्रक(?) रूपकाणि बहुधा दृष्ट्वा जने(?) निक्षिपेत्
 वंशोदित्त (?) रसिद्धिरोगजननाग (?)...न्विते स्थापिते तथा च वस्त्रे केशादिकं कृत्वा
 स्त्रयं भुक्तुमुमेन(?) तु अमिताभेन सन्निध्यामुच्येत् पटमुत्तमं प्रज्ञोपाय समायोगात्
 हृदि धू(ध्या)त्वा तु मन्त्रवित् लिखनीयदेवताया मन्त्रेणाष्टशतेन वै मन्त्रपि(?)त्वा पटं
 कार्यं सवसंपतुस्त्रयावहमिति (सर्वसम्पत्सुखावहमिति) दार्वादि गत(?)
 शल्लोद्धरणविधिः ।



GLOSSARY AND ADDITIONAL NOTES.

(i)

Āṅguli : The unit in Indian lineal measurement. It is of two kinds, *viz.*, (1) absolute (*mānāṅgula*) and (2) relative (*mātrāṅgula*). For a full discussion about it refer to pages 25-33.

The observation made by me in lines 12-16 of page 33, to explain the difference between the Sanskrit text and its Chinese translation about the face-length of Buddha images (Sanskrit— $13\frac{1}{2}$ *añ.*; Chinese— $12\frac{1}{2}$ *añ.*) should be modified. The evidence supplied by the actual measurement of some Buddha images of different periods (see Appendix B) shows that the length measurement of the face of many early Buddha icons closely approximated to $13\frac{1}{2}$ *dehāṅgulas*; so, the words *sārdḍha-trayodaśīmātrā* in verse 2 of our text do not seem to be a late interpolation. *Śl.* 1 & fol.

Āyāma : Length; its other equivalents are *āyata* and *dīrgha*. *Śl.* 4.

Bandha : Tendons. P. 9, l. 7.

Bāhu : Upper arm. *Śl.* 24.

Bodhisattva : A class of divinities in the *Mahāyāna* and *Vajrayāna* theology, who, though eminently capable of attaining Buddha-hood, will not aspire after it for the benefit of the created beings. P. 9, ll. 8-9.

Cibuka : Chin. *Śl.* 3.

Citāntarāmsa : The space between the shoulders on the back (*aṃsa*) is raised; this physical feature is one of the signs of a great man. *Śl.* 23.

Dakṣiṇāvarta-mūrdhaja : Hair (*mūrdhaja*) curling from left to right; one of the *mahāpuruṣalakṣaṇas*. *Śl.* 16.

Drṣṭi : Same as *drktārā* of Varāhamihira which has been explained by Utpala as 'madhyabartinī kumārī,' i.e., the pupil (?) inside the eye. *Śl.* 11.

Goḷi : The short vertical dimple below the septum on the middle of the upper lip; other variants—*gocchā* (*Bṛhat Saṃhitā*), *gocī*, etc. *Śl.* 8.

Grīvā : Neck. *Śls.* 22-23.

Gulpha : The bony protuberance on the ankle. In Sanskrit lexicons, these synonyms of the word are given—*pāda-granthi*, *caranagranthi*, etc. *Śls.* 41 & 44.

Hanu : Jaw; the portion of the face below the cheek; cf. the explanation of this term in *Sabdakalpadruma* : *kapoladvaya-paramukhabhāgaḥ hanuḥ. Yatra jambhākṣyā dantā jāyante iti Subhūtiḥ. Hanti kaṭhoramapi dravyaṃ hanuḥ nāmnīti uḥ. Śl.* 5.

Jaṅghā : Shank—the portion of the leg from below the knee-cap to just above the bony protuberance (*gulpha*) on the ankle. *Śl.* 43.

Kakṣa : The root of the upper arm; *kakṣapuṭa* is armpit.

Kapola : Cheek. *Śl.* 4.

Kaphoṇi : Elbow. *Śl.* 25.

Karavīra : The inside red flesh in the near (nose-end) corners of the eyes. Utpala gives *dūṣika* as its synonym. *Śl.* 13.

Karṇalatā : The leaf of the ear—i.e., the whole ear (measured lengthwise). *Śl.* 20.

Karṇāvarta : Earhole. *Śl.* 18.

Kāya : (1) Body; (2) image; (3) length. P. 9, ll. 4-5.

Kēśasthāna : Scalp. *Śl.* 1.

Lekhā : Lines [*Lekhā-paṅktiḥ iti Medini*]; or signs, marks, etc. *Śl.* 27.

Maṇibandha : Wrist. *Śl.* 30.

Mātrā : (Here) measuring unit, i.e., an *aṅgula*; thus *mātrika* means measuring one *mātrā* or *aṅgula*. *Mātrāṅgula* is different in its connotation from *Mānāṅgula* (for details, refer to my notes on *aṅgula*). *Śl.* 2.

Medhira : Penis; male organ of generation. *Śl.* 38.

Nāsāvaṁśa : Nasal septum ; or nasal bridge as the lexicons put it. In the latter case, the rendering of this word in the English Translation of our text and our note on it will have to be modified. *Śl.* 10.

Nāsikāpuṭa : Nostrils. *Śl.* 13.

Netrakośa : Socket of the eye. *Śl.* 12.

Nirgama : Orifice. P. 9, l. 7 ; *Śls.* 6 & 8.

Nyagrodhaparimaṇḍala : A human figure whose full height is equal to its width across the chest, along the line of the arms fully outstretched. Here, the unusual width of the chest and the excessive length of the arms are emphasised.

Addl. Notes.—*Nyagrodhaparimaṇḍala* type of human body was regarded as perfectly symmetrical by the Indians. The words, *mān'-unmāna-ppamāṇa-paḍīpunna-sujaya-savv'-aṅga-suṇḍar'-aṅgaṃ* occurring in the description of Mahāvīra's body (*Kalpasutra*, ed. Jacobi, p. 35) have been translated by Jacobi as 'a boy on whose body all limbs will be well-formed, and of full volume, weight, and length' (*S. B. E.*, XXII, p. 221). Mahāvīra is further described as 'having a body perfectly symmetrical, the son of symmetrical mother, and the most symmetrical of his family' (Stevenson, *The Kalpasutra, and the Navatatva*, p. 81). Evidently in all this, the above type of human body is referred to. This view is corroborated by the fact that one of the attributive epithets applied to the inhabitants of the Svetadvīpa which was visited by Nārada has this significance. These dwellers of the Svetadvīpa are described as *sama-mānonmānāḥ* (*Mahābhārata*, Vangavāsī ed., Ch. XII, 335, 10) which can only mean 'One whose height and width are the same' (needless to say, the 'width,' here, should be explained in the same manner in which it has been explained in the case of the word *nyagrodhaparimaṇḍala*). Nīlakanṭha wrongly explains this word in his commentary when he writes, *mānaśc-onmānascopamānaśca samau yeṣāṃ te*, for there

can be no question of the *upamānas* (the measurements of the interspaces) being the same as the *māna* (width) and *unmāna* (height) of a human body. It seems that the words *māna-unmāna-ppamāna* in the Jaina texts should be correctly translated as 'a body whose *māna* and *unmāna* are full and equal (*ppamāna*; the word is evidently not used in its technical sense here). The exact significance of the term *nyagrodhaparimaṇḍala* was not lost sight of even at a late period, when it was used to denote one of the characteristic features of a *Mahāpuruṣa*. Thus, Kṛṣṇadās Kavirāj while describing the figure of Mahāprabhu Śrī Caitanya, correctly explains this term in these lines :—

তপ্তহেমসমকান্তি প্রকাণ্ড শরীর ।

নবমেঘজিনি কণ্ঠধ্বনি যে গম্ভীর ॥ ৩২ ॥

দৈর্ঘ্য বিস্তার যেই আপনার হাতে ।

চারিহাত হয়ে মহাপুরুষ বিখ্যাত ॥ ৩৩ ॥

অগ্রোধপরিমণ্ডল হয়ে তার নাম ।

অগ্রোধপরিমণ্ডল তনু চৈতন্য গুণধাম ॥ ৩৪ ॥

আজানু লম্বিত ভুজ কমললোচন ।

তিলফুল সম নাসা স্খাংশু বদন ॥ ৩৫ ॥

(*Caitanyacaritāmṛta*, ādi, 3, 32-5.)

'The colour of his (Caitanya's) large body resembles that of the molten gold; his voice is deeper even than the rumble of fresh clouds. Those who are *mahāpuruṣas* measure 4 cubits, both length and breadth-wise, according to their own cubits; such men are known as *nyagrodhaparimaṇḍala* and the body of Caitanya, the receptacle of all qualities, was of this type. He had arms extending down to his knees, eyes like lotuses, a nose like *til* (sesamum), flower and a face like the moon.' The above passage in the *Caitanyacaritāmṛta* has been thus commented on, in the commentary : 'দৈর্ঘ্য ও প্রস্থে আপনার হাতে চারি হস্ত পরিমিত দেহকে প্রকাণ্ড শরীর বলে ও অগ্রোধপরিমণ্ডলও বলে । মহাপুরুষের একটী চিহ্ন । ফলিত কথা এই আজানুলম্বিত বাহু হইলেই প্রকাণ্ডশরীর হয় ।' To

translate this passage freely : ' A body which measures 4 cubits (according to its own cubit) both in its length and breadth (compass of its arms) is called *prakāṇḍaśarīra* as also *nyagrodha-parimaṇḍala*. It is one of the signs of a great man. Really speaking, one whose arms reach down to his knees is called *prakāṇḍaśarīra*.' P. 9, l. 4.

Parigraha }
Parikṣepa } : Measurement of the circumference or peri-
Parīṇāha } phery. *Śl.* 32 ; *Śl.* 30 ; *Śls.* 21 and 41.

Pārṣṇī : Heel. *Śl.* 45.

Parva : Digit. *Śls.* 27-29.

Prabāhu : Forearm. *Śl.* 24.

Pramāṇa : Measure (in general); but, in iconometry, it more particularly means 'the width measurement,' its other synonyms being *vistāra*, *tāra*, *str̥ti*, *viśr̥ti*, *viśrtam*, *vyāsa*, *visārita*, *vipula*, *tata*, *viṣkambha* and *viśāla*. P. 9, ll. 7-8 ; *Śl.* 1.

Samudgaka : Eye ball. *Śl.* 12.

Samyak sambuddha : *Sammāsambuddha* (in Pali) applied to the great Buddha who is the thorough master of all true knowledge. Colophon.

Sandhi : Joints. P. 9, l. 7.

Sandhibandha : Tissues of joints. *Sandhibandhanam* means a 'ligament,' tendon or 'nerve.' The sense of the term in *Śl.* 42. is not clear.

Siromaṇi : Crest-jewel. *Śl.* 15.

Skandhāṁsa : The shoulders. *Śl.* 23.

Śṛkkanī : The lateral ends of the mouth. *Śl.* 6.

Śrotas : Aperture (of the nose) ; thus, nostril, here. *Śl.* 9.

Sugata : An epithet of Buddha. P. 9, l. 7.

Tārā : The pupil of the eye—the black ball of the eye, distinct from *dr̥ṣṭi* and *samudga* which seem to be included in it. *Śl.* 11.

Uccheda : The measurement of the height or thickness ; its other synonyms are : *bahala*, *ghana*, *miti*, *utcchrāya*, *tuṅga*, *unnata*, *udaya*, *uccha*, *niṣkrama*, *niṣkṛti*, *nirgama*, *nirgati* and *udgama* (T. A. G. Rao). P. 9, l. 7 ; *Śl.* 5, etc.

Uṛṇā : A circle of hair between the eye-brows. *Śls.* 14-15.

Uṣṇīṣa : (1) A turban ; (2) a small truncated cone projecting from the centre of the skull ; a cranial protuberance (a later significance). *Uṇhīsasīsa* in the early Pāli texts signified a head whose outline was like that of an expanded umbrella. Did *uṣṇīṣa*, at any time during its early use, denote 'an umbrella,' from its root meaning 'a sunshade,' 'a protection from the sun?'

Rai Bahadur R. P. Chanda, B.A., while discussing the problem of the hair and *uṣṇīṣa* on Buddha heads, opines that *uṣṇīṣa-sīrṣa* means a turban-head, i. e., 'a head which is either round in form like a turban or has the appearance of a head wearing a turban even when bare on account of a strip of muscle covering the upper part of the forehead' (*I. H. Quarterly*, September, 1931, p. 672). He takes the early Kuṣāṇa Buddha heads of Mathurā as representing the latter type and according to him 'the elevated part reaching from the root of the right ear to that of the left is nothing but the plastic representation of the *mamsapātala* spoken of by Buddhaghosha' while commenting on the *lakṣaṇa uṇhīsasīsa* in his *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*. But, as I fully pointed out elsewhere (*I. H. Quarterly*, September, 1931, pp. 505-07), the raised portion of the forehead from the hair line upwards in these Buddha heads simply represents the thickness of the smooth hair drawn up close and tight over the scalp into a single thick tress. What Buddhaghosha actually means by *mamsapātala* which covers the whole of the forehead is that the forehead is full, fleshy and convex in appearance, there being no depression in it as in those of the ordinary mortals. That this was the significance put by him upon this word is proved if we refer to his comment on another *mahāpuruṣa lakṣaṇa*, viz., *citan-taramsa*, where also it is used. We quote this in full to elucidate

our point :—*Citantaramso ti antaramso vuccati dvinnam koṭṭhānam antaram. Tam citam paripunnam antaramsam assā ti citantaramso. Aññesaṃ hi tam ṭhānaṃ ninnam hoti, dve piṭṭhikoṭṭhāsā pāṭiyekkaṃ paññāyanti. Mahāpurisassa pana kaṭito paṭṭhāya maṃsapataḷaṃ yāva khandhā uggamma samussita-suvannāphalakaṃ viya piṭṭhiṃ chādetvā patiṭṭhitam* (I. H. Quarterly, Dec., 1929, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, p. 75). Thus, the manner and the context in which the word *maṃsapataḷa* is used by Buddhaghosha, here (as well as in his comment on *unhīsasīsa*), leave little doubt as to the exact significance of this word and we shall not be justified in holding the view that Buddhaghosha refers to an *extraneous* strip of flesh over the whole of the forehead from the right ear to the left ear or over the whole spinal cord from the waist up to the shoulders, of a *mahāpuruṣa* or Buddha, when he uses the word *maṃsapataḷa*. It was compared by Buddhaghosha to the royal turban (*unhīsapatṭa*) in one case and to a raised gold tablet (*samussita-suvannāphalaka*) in the other, in order to emphasise the full fleshy feature of particular portions of Buddha's body. Buddhaghosha was very fond of using similes and metaphors to explain himself clearly and most of these *lakṣaṇas* are compared by him to one or other object in his commentary ; thus, while commenting on the *lakṣaṇa unṇā* between the near ends of the eyebrows of Buddha, he compares it with as many as three things, viz., (1) *suvannaphalakamajjhe ṭhapitarajatabubbulakam*, (2) *suvannaghataṭonikkhamamānā khīradhārā*, and (3) *aruṇappabhārañjite gaganappadese osadhitārakā* (op. cit., p. 77). P. 9, l. 6 ; *Śl.* 1.

Vistāra : The measurement of the width; for its other equivalents see under *pramāṇa*. P. 9, l. 7 ; *Śls.* 9, 10, etc.

Vṛṣaṇa : Testes. *Śl.* 39.

Vyāma : The measurement, along the chest of the body, from the tip of the medius of the one hand to the same of the other, when both the arms are fully outstretched ; the compass of the arms. P. 9, ll. 4-5.

(ii)

Of the 32 greater signs and 80 lesser signs, the following are mentioned in our text :—

(In alphabetical order.)

Cakrāṅkitapādatalaḥ.

Cakra, Śaṅkha and other auspicious marks on the palm.

Catvāriṃśaddaśanaḥ.

Chatrākāra-śiraḥ.

Chatrākāra-skandhaḥ.

Citāntarāmsaḥ.

Dakṣiṇāvartamūrdhajaḥ.

Gūḍhāsthi.

Gūḍha-gulphaḥ.

Gūḍha-śiraḥ.

Kūrmaprṣṭhasamapādaḥ.

Mahāsimhahanuḥ.

Nīlamūrdhajaḥ.

Nyagrodhaparimaṇḍalaḥ.

Śiromaṇiḥ.

Sukumārapāṇipādatalaḥ.

Supraṭiṣṭhitapādaḥ.

Tāmraṇakhaḥ.

Ūrṇā (keśaḥ).

Uṣṇīṣa (śiraṣkatā).

(iii)

Explanatory Notes to the Plates.

Frontispiece : Standing Buddha, now in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow. It hails from Kaṭra mound, Mathurā and like all other Mathurā sculptures is carved out of red sandstone.

There is an inscription on the pedestal of the image, from which we learn that it was dedicated by the nun Jayabhaddā in the Gupta year 230 (549-50 A.D.). The image, though not one of the finest specimens of the Gupta period, is iconographically interesting. It has an elaborately decorated halo behind its head and torso, *uṣṇīṣa* with well-arranged short *dakṣiṇāvarta* curls over it and the head, *ūrṇā* in the shape of a tiny circular mark (not a raised mole—but an outline drawing of a circle; this is the way in which this *lakṣaṇa* is depicted in the very few Buddha figures of the Gupta period where it is present; for a few other known Gupta specimens with this mark, compare my notes on *Ūrṇā*) just above the junction of the two eyebrows, full garments (*tricivara*) of a monk, with raised, parallel ridges of heavy folds, covering both the shoulders. It has its right hand in the *abhaya* pose, the left holding the hem of the *saṅghāṭī* falling down in heavy folds below it. The right palm bears some interesting peculiarities (these cannot be easily distinguished in the reproduction). There is an elliptical wheel or lotus in its middle (not usually found in the Buddha specimens of the Gupta period). The space between the thumb and the index finger and that between the ring and the little fingers bear criss-cross lines showing that the artist intended to depict, in this manner, the *jāla-lakṣaṇa* which, according to him, signified that the fingers of the Great Man were really connected by a net and not a web. I know of no other Buddha image (with one probable exception—a small Buddha figure, 1' 7½", in the Sarnath Museum; Sahni, *Sarnath Museum Catalogue*, p. 106, B(c) 113—the peculiarity has not been noticed by the author) where this feature is present. One other interesting feature of this relief should be noticed. In the case of some Gupta Buddhas, usually standing, as here, the whole slab out of which the image was to be carved, was divided into three unequal sections—one consisting of the halo on which the head, the upper arms and the upper part of the torso of the figure were made to rest, the next in which the portion of the body

down to the knee was carved, and the last containing the obtuse-angled pedestal on which the foreleg, feet and the lower section of the *antaravāsaka* and the cup-shaped *saṅghāṭi* were done in high relief. Thus in a very skilful manner, the artist while not making his image fully in the round, attempted to give this specious appearance to a sculpture which was in reality a production in a very high relief. An interesting iconometric datum is also supplied us by this image. Its whole height (including *uṣṇīṣa*) is 1,045 mm. Now, if we divide 1045 by 120, we get 8·7 (other decimal places are left out) which is its *dehāṅgula* unit. Multiplying 8·7 by 13·5 (*sārdhattrayodasī-mātrā mukha*) we get 117·45 which ought to be the length of its face. Now, when measured, the actual face length of this figure appears to be 117 mm. which also is the width of its face. So, here we see a remarkable conformity between the theory and the actual practice. I measured the width of the middle digit of its medius and found it to be 12 mm. So, that could never have served as the unit of this image.

Plates 1 and 2.—These are copied from two full-page drawings in the Chinese work in which our text has been translated and commented on. The sections in which these two outlines of Buddha images are divided do not appear to have been drawn to scale. I am indebted to Dr. Kalidas Nag of the Calcutta University for his kindly permitting me to make some use of the Chinese work which was brought by him from China, a few years ago. Dr. P. C. Bagchi is now engaged in a detailed study of the Chinese commentary of our text.

ERRATA

The word अङ्गल has been misprinted in many places in the Text (such as, p. 16, l. 7 ; p. 11, ll. 1-3 and 10 ; p. 12, ll. 1-2, 6 and 8 ; p. 13, ll. 5 and 11 ; etc.) and the notes (such as, p. 27, l. 26 ; p. 33, l. 21 ; etc.) as अङ्गल ; it should always be read as अङ्गल ।

P. 9, l. 6, read संस्थितोष्णीषत्वादि, for संस्थितोष्णीषेत्यादि ।


P. 12, f. n. 6, l. 2, read -च्चापाकारं, for -च्चापाकारं ।

P. 19, f. n. 16, l. 5, read सर्वदर्शिनाम्, for सर्वदर्शिना ।

P. 28, l. 10, read नवमेऽंशके, for नवमेऽंशे ।

P. 36, l. 4, read ऊर्णा, for उर्णा ; the English transliteration of the term should always be *ūrṇā*.

P. 38, ll. 14-15, read कृत्वाकारं शिरस्कन्धं संस्थितोष्णीषत्वादि, for कृत्वाकारः शिरःस्कन्धां संस्थितोष्णीषेत्यादि ।



RAJA GANESH

By

TAMONASHCHANDRA DAS GUPTA

In the list of patrons who befriended our Bengali literature at different periods of its history the name of Raja Ganesh somehow found a place. It has been stated that it was at his court, that our first great poet Krittivāsa appeared and received the royal command to compose his epoch-making poem. The name of Raja Ganesh on account of his association with the popular poet of Bengal is of special interest to scholars, who have been trying to solve the mystery encircling his life.

In this connection the first point that comes across the mind for consideration is whether Raja Ganesh and Danujmardan were one and the same person or two entirely different persons. There is a considerable difference¹ of opinion, however, amongst scholars on this matter.

Our first attempt would naturally be to sift the evidence of the old Bengali literature with a view to throw all available light on this point.

(a) In the autobiography of Krittivāsa the following two lines occur :—

¹ Among those who consider Raja Ganesh and Danujmardan as one and the same person we may mention Messrs. Stapleton, Nalini K. Bhattachali, Nagendra Nath Vasu and Dr. Dinesh Chandra Sen. Among those who believe in separate identity the most prominent are Messrs. Rakhaldas Banerjée and Nikhilnath Ray.

পূৰ্বেৰতে আছিল বেদানুজ মহাৰাজ।

তাৰ পাৰ্শ্বত ছিল নৰসিংহ ওৰা ॥

—কৃষ্ণবাসী ৰামায়ণ, কৃষ্ণবাসীৰ আত্মচৰিত।

(Once there was a king named Bedanuja. His minister was Narasingha Ojhā.—

(The autobiography of Krittivāsa in his Rāmāyana.)

Dr. D. C. Sen and others of his line of thought consider that 'Bedānuja' is a mis-reading, the letter "বে" has been read as "বৈ." They hold that it should be "Ye Danuja" ("যে দনুজ"). The name of Danujmardan has been according to this view mentioned in the famous Ramayana of Krittivāsa.

(b) In the celebrated Vaishnava work Bhaktiratnākara (written in Bengali) we find a Sanskrit quotation from the Laghutosini of Jiba Goswami, which contains the name of Danujmardan Deva :—

ততোদনুজমৰ্দন ক্ষিতিপূজ্যপাদঃ।

ক্ৰমাৎপূজ্য নবহট্টকে স কিল পদ্মনাভকৃতি।

—ভক্তিরত্নাকর।

(That person of consequence, Padmanābha, gradually settled at Nabahatta and became honoured by the king Danujmardan.—

Bhaktiratnākara.)

N.B.—Nabahatta seems to be the famous village Naihati near Katowa and not the Naihati (E. B. Ry.) near Calcutta. Padmanābha was the forefather of Jiba Goswami. There is scarcely any other reference to Danujmardan in old Bengali literature (so far as our information goes), but the coins, on the contrary, of Danuj are found, while there is no numismatic evidence directly about Ganesh anywhere up till now. This fact is significant, no doubt.

Now, so far as the name of Ganesh is concerned the following references are important :—

(a) প্রভাকরের পুত্র নরসিংহ নাড়িয়াল ।

গণেশ রাজার মন্ত্রী লোকে ঘোষে সর্বকাল ॥

—প্রেমবিলাস (নিত্যানন্দদাস বিরচিত),

চতুর্বিংশ বিলাস, পৃঃ ২৮৪ ।

(Narasingha Nāriāl, son of Prabhākara, was always known as the minister of Raja Ganesh.—

Prembilās by Nityānanda Das,¹

24 Vilas, p. 284.)

N. B.—Mr. Nagendranath Vasu's version of the Sadānanda-Kārikā contains the name of one Prabhākara who was the great-grandfather of Raja Ganesh.

(b) দৈবে শ্রীহট্ট হৈতে শ্রীগণেশ রাজা ।

নরসিংহ নাড়িয়ালে করিলেক পূজা ॥

—প্রেমবিলাস, চতুর্বিংশ বিলাস, পৃঃ ২৮৪ ।

(Fate brought Narasingha Nāriāl from Sylhet to the presence of Raja Ganesh who honoured him.—

Prembilās by Nityānanda Das,

24th Vilas, p. 284.)

N.B.—According to Adwait-Prakāś 1329 Saka or 1407 A.D. was the date of the conquest of Gaur by Ganesh.

¹ The genuineness of the four vilāsas after the 20th is rightly doubted by many, and as such the references about the various Brahmin sub-castes found in the 24th vilāsa may be considered as spurious. Still I made use of the above two references for our present purpose.

- (c) যেই নরসিংহ নাড়িয়াল বলি খ্যাত ।
 সিদ্ধ শ্রোত্রিয়াখ্য আরু ওঝার বংশজাত ॥
 যেই নরসিংহঘণ ঘোষে ত্রিভুবন ।
 সর্ববশান্ত্রে স্থপণ্ডিত অতি বিচক্ষণ ॥
 ষাঁহার মন্ত্রণাবলে শ্রীগণেশ রাজা ।
 গোড়ের বাদসাহ মারি গোড়ের হৈল রাজা ॥
 ষাঁর কন্যা বিবাহে হয় কাপের উৎপত্তি ।
 লাউর প্রদেশে হয় ষাঁহার বসতি ॥

—অদ্বৈত প্রকাশ (ঈশান নাগর কৃত) ।

(He, who was known as Narasingha Nāriāl and belonged to 'Siddha-Srotriya' Brahmin family of Aru Ojha—he, whose fame spreads through the three worlds and who was versed in all the Sāstras and very intelligent—he, whose advise made it possible for Ganesh to become the Raja at Gaur by killing the Badsāha of Gaur and the marriage of whose daughter occasioned the family of Kāps—he, whose home was the locality of Lāur, etc., etc.

Adwait-Prakās by Ishān Nāgar.)

(d) Besides the above, the Sanskrit work known as "Balya-Lilā Sutra" (by Lāuriā Krishnadās) which deals with the early life of Adwaitāchāryya mentions incidentally of Raja Ganesh as follows :—

শ্রীমান নৃসিংহস্য মহাত্মনো বৈ
 বশঃপ্রসূনে স্মৃতিতে মনোজ্ঞ ।
 তৎসৌরভব্যবহিমোহিতাত্মা
 রাজা গণেশো বহুশাস্ত্রদর্শী ।
 সদবংশশৈলে ¹ দ্বিজরাজকল্লৌ
 বেদজ্ঞসুবিপ্রসমাশ্রয়োয়ঃ ।

¹ This 'সদবংশশৈলে' becomes 'কারস্থশৈলে' in 'বগুড়ার ইতিহাস' written by Pravas Chandra Dev Barman, a Kayastha.

দুৰ্ঘস্ত শাস্তা কিল সাধুপালো
 দাতা গুণজ হরিভক্তচূড়ঃ ।^১
 দূতৈস্তমানীয় চ রাজধাত্মাং
 দিনাজপুরাথো বহুসভাযুক্তে ।
 তস্মিন্‌সিংহে বহুনীতাভিজ্ঞে
 সংগ্ৰস্ত মন্ত্ৰিত্ব মবাপ ভদ্রম্ ।
 তদ্ব্যক্তিচাতুর্য্যবলেন রাজা
 শ্রীমদগনেশো বরদস্বরূপান্ ।
 গোড়স্তপালান্ যবনান্নজান্ হি
 জিত্বা চ গোড়েশ্বরতামবাপ ।
 গ্রহপক্ষাঙ্কিশশধৃতিমিতে শাকে স্তুবুদ্ধিমান্ ।
 গণেশো যবনং জিত্বা গোড়েকচ্ছত্রধৃগভূৎ ।
 —শ্রীবালালীলাসূত্র (লাউড়িয়া কৃষ্ণদাস কৃত),
 ১ম সর্গ, শ্রীঅচ্যুতচরণ চৌধুরী তত্ত্বনিধি
 সম্পাদিত, ১১ পৃষ্ঠা ।

The meaning of the whole piece is—Raja Ganesh, who was well-versed in all the Sāstras, was charmed with the fame of the great Nrisingha. Therefore, the king,—who belonged to good lineage and was its chief representative (*lit.* like the moon shining over the cliff of lineage), who was well-versed in the lore of the Vedas, who was the supporter of all good Brahmins, who was the punisher of all evil-doers, who was the maintainer of all good men, who was charitably disposed, who was the appreciator of all deserving men, who was the most devout (*lit.* pinnacle) among all the devotees of God

^১ It is peculiar that while at this place we find the epithet of Ganesh as 'হরিভক্তচূড়ঃ,' i.e., a very staunch devotee of the God Hari (and therefore he was a Vaishnava) we again find about Danujmardan the epithet of 'চণ্ডীচরণপরাধরঃ,' i.e., "a worshipper of the Goddess Chandi"; this may be accounted for by the fact that Bengal in those days of great religious toleration, had worshippers who paid their tribute of devotion to all the gods and goddesses of the Hindu pantheon.

Hari—brought Nrisingha to his capital at Dinajpur which was full of courtiers. That good Nrisingha, who was an adept in politics, was given the post of a minister by the king. It was the crafty policy of Nrisingha which made it possible for Ganesh to secure victory over the freebooting Mahomedans who were rulers of Gaur, and attain the position of the Lord of Gaur. It was in 1329 Saka (1407 A.D.) that clever Ganesh defeated the Mahomedan ruler and became the undisputed ruler over Gaur.

Sri Bālyalilā-Sūtra by Lāuriā Krishnadās,
1st Canto, 11th page. Edited by Achyutacharan Chaudhuri.

The above quotations provide us with the names of Danujmardan and Ganesh. If it may be shown that they were contemporary then, of course, this evidence will go a great way in proving their identity as one person. Besides if it may be proved that a certain individual was courtier in the courts of both of them, then, surely Danuj and Ganesh will be taken as one and the same person. Circumstantial evidence may also help us in this direction.


N.B.—The late Mr. Rakhal Das Banerjee believed in separate identity¹ and maintained that Danuj was a feudatory chief in 1417 A.D. during the time of Jadu and earned the epithet of Danujmardan due to his hostility to the Mahomedans. Both Mr. Banerjee and his opponents agreed so far as numismatic evidences about the dates go, but arrived at quite different conclusions as regards the identity of Ganesh with Danujmardan. The critics with the rival theory believed that Ganesh himself adopted the name of

¹ According to Mr. Nalinikanta Bhattacharya, Mr. Rakhal Das Banerjee latterly changed his opinion and was in favour of identifying Danuj with Ganesh. See পঞ্চপুণ, ভৈরব ১৩৩৮ B. S., in which he refutes the argument of Mr. Nikhil N. Ray whose article appeared in পঞ্চপুণ, কান্তন, ১৩৩৮ B. S.

Danujmardan after destroying the Mahomedan rule of Gaur. The word "Danuj" may here be taken to mean the Mahomedans and the term "Mardan" means "destroyer." So the word quite fits the theory of Ganesh being taken as Danujmardan. Although Ferishta was of opinion that Ganesh favoured the Mahomedans, Riaz held a quite different view. Yet, it may be surmised that his very fight with the Mahomedans for the throne of Gaur might have prompted him to issue coins in that name (Danujmardan). The dates of the coins issued by Danujmardan and those by Jadu are the sources of great puzzle. Some coins of both are almost contemporary while no coin in the name of Ganesh has yet been found. The temporary occupation of the throne by Jadu during the life-time of his father Ganesh, if it ever happened, may partly explain the problem. The real difficulty with Ganesh and Danujmardan is that coins of the latter are profusely found even in the remote districts of Chittagong, Maldah and Subarnagram, and even the coins of Jadu are found in numbers, but not a single coin in the name of Ganesh has yet been discovered.

Before drawing any conclusion, let us first mention here the genealogies of some persons who were connected with either Danuj or Ganesh.

1. The genealogy of Krittivās:—



2. Adwaitācharyya's genealogy :—

Narasingha Nāriāl (a minister to Raja Ganesh).

Chhakari

Kuver Pandit

Kamalākanta (Kamalākara Chakravarti or Adwaitāchāryya or Sadāsiva—He was originally an inhabitant of Lāur in Sylhet and was born in 1434 A.D. or 52 years before Chaitanya Deva).

3. Padmanābha's genealogy :—

Jagat Guru (a king of Karnāta in the Deccan, reigned till 1414 A.D.)

Aniruddha (died in 1416 A.D.).

Rupeswara

Harihara

(He came to Bengal and became a minister. He died in 1433 A.D.)

Padmanābha (He was honoured by Raja Danujmardan and built a house at Navahatta or Naihati near Katowa).

Purusottama

Jagannātha

Nārāyana

Murari

Mukunda

Kumāra Deva (settled temporarily at Backerganj.).

Sanātana

Rupa

Ballava

(alias Anupama.
Jiva Goswami,
his son, born
1513 A.D.).

(4) Remarks about the genealogies :—


From the above genealogical tables as well as quotations it may be seen that Raja Ganesh had one minister named Narasingha Nāriāl whose politic advice was responsible for the upset of the Islamic rule in Bengal for a brief period. Again, it may also be seen that Raja Danujmardan had two ministers, *e.g.*, Padmanābha and Narasingha Ojhā. The home of Narasingha Nāriāl was at Santipur while that of Narasingha Ojhā was at Fulia—an adjacent village. Besides, the home of Padmanābha was at Nabahatta or Naihati, not very far from Katowa in the District of Burdwan. The genealogical tables will clearly show that Narasingha Ojhā and Narasingha Nāriāl as well as Padmanābha were contemporary. In spite of some discrepancy of the dates of Danuj, Ganesh and Jadu and conflicting opinions chiefly on the basis of stray numismatic evidence, we are inclined to say that on the basis of literary evidence Narasingha Nāriāl and Narasingha Ojhā were surely contemporary and as such, Danuj and Ganesh were also contemporary. Now, if we accept the proposition that Ganesh occupied the throne of Gaud and became a powerful king then how another prince named Danuj could rule with power, side by side, in the same period with minister and court not very far from Gaur (rather to the opposite bank of the Ganges) and yet not mentioned profusely in Bengali literature, while Ganesh is repeatedly mentioned with respect in this literature? If Ganesh and Danuj were two monarchs then such a state of things would no doubt be absurd. Under the circumstances we have got no option, so far as the evidence of the Bengali Literature goes, but to accept Ganesh and Danuj as one and the same person and that is the reason why coins in the name of Ganesh is not found. It seems that Danujmardan was the title of Ganesh after his occupation of the throne of Gaur by killing the Mahomedan sovereign. Now, some people think that Narasingha Ojhā and Narasingha

Nāriāl were one and the same person. It is surely not so. Narasingha Nāriāl was a Barendra Brahmin of Srotriya (Non-Kulin) family while Narasingha Ojhā was a Rāḍhi Brahmin of Fulia, the village giving rise to the name of a special class (gāin) of Rāḍhi Mukherjee Kulin Brahmins. Besides, the home of the former was originally at Naruli in Sylhet (in the easternmost corner of East Bengal) and later on at Santipur (in the Nuddea District of West Bengal) while the latter (*e.g.*, Narasingha Ojhā) hailed from Fateabad Perganah (in the District of Backerganj) and later on settled at Fulia (also in Nuddea District) by the side of the Ganges and near Santipur. The forefathers of Padmanābha also hailed from different places and he settled finally at Naihati near Katowa (Murshidabad District) coming from Backerganj side. Under the circumstances Narasingha Ojhā and Narasingha Nāriāl must be taken as different persons and on the basis of literary and genealogical evidences, all three, *e.g.*, Narasingha Nāriāl, Narasingha Ojhā and Padmanābha (the forefather of Jiba Goswami who belonged to the Kārṇāṭa Brahmin family) were separate but nevertheless contemporary persons.

Further, Danuj had ministers (*e.g.* Padmanābha and Narasingha Ojhā) one of which (*e.g.*, Narasingha Ojhā) lived in the neighbourhood of the residence of Narasingha Nāriāl who was the minister of Ganesh. If Danuj and Ganesh were separate persons then of course the two ministers of two powerful and contemporary sovereigns were living side by side. This idea of different personalities of Danuj and Ganesh, is far from tenable from circumstantial evidence. Ganesh was a pillar of the Barendra Brahmin society and as such performed yeoman's service to his community with the help of his able minister Narasingha Nāriāl while Danuj with the help of his Rāḍhi Brahmin minister (*e.g.*, Narasingha Ojhā) could also do the same and surely the literature on social subjects would not pass this unnoticed. But there are no such records to prove this. So from various viewpoints we have

no alternative but to accept the proposition that Danuj and Ganesh were one and the same person with at least three principal ministers, *e.g.*, Narasingha Nārial, Narasingha Ojhā and Padmanābha.

From the genealogical and other records it is evident that Krittivās could not be present in the court of Raja Ganesh or Danuj mentioned above. Krittivās possibly attended the court of Raja Kamsanārāyaṇ of Tahirpur (Rajshahi District).¹ About the courtiers of Gaureswar as mentioned by Krittivās it may be said from the authority of গোড়ে ব্রাহ্মণ that শ্রীবৎস or really শ্রীকৃষ্ণ was sister's husband to Raja Kamsanārāyaṇ. Sri-Krishna's sons were Subuddhi Ray, Kesab Khan, and Jagadānanda Ray which may be shown from the genealogical table below :—



¹ By the by, our mind should be disabused of the theory that Krittivās, a descendant of Narasingha Ojhā, attended the court of Raja Ganesh.


The genealogical records point to Kamsanārāyaṇ and further mentions the names of Jagadānanda and Kedar Ray (or Khan). Thus, there is no doubt that Krittivās visited the court of the powerful chief Kamsanārāyaṇ whose title of "Gaureswara" as given

As for the name "Datta Khan" the credit of its discovery and identification with the name "Ganesh" chiefly rests with Mr. Nagendranath Vasu. We learn from him that the genealogical work of the Rāḍhi Brahmins named Mahāvamśa by Dhruvānanda Miśra (a book of great authority so far as the Rāḍhi Brahmin genealogy is concerned) mentions a powerful chief named Śrī-Datta Khan who could be no other than Ganesh and whom Mr. Vasu styled fully as Ganesh Datta Khan. He supports his view by saying that another genealogical work named Sadānanda Kārikā (a book of high authority with the 'Uttar Rāḍhiya' Kāyastha families) mentions the name Ganesh Datta Khan. To Mr. Vasu Śrī-Datta and Ganesh Datta are synonymous, and incidentally he tries to prove that Ganesh, who had been known so long as a Barendra Brahmin, was not so, but a Kāyastha by caste. We cannot follow the line of argument of Mr. Vasu. Śrī-Datta might only be a contemporary of (and not identical with) Śrī Ganesh. Why can Śrī-Datta be not taken as a name, we do not at all understand. This Śrī-Datta might be a name just as Śrī-Pati and Śrī-Manta are names. If it is a title, then why was the full name, *e.g.*, Śrī Ganesh Datta never mentioned by the genealogical work in question (*e.g.*, Mahāvamśa)? As for the title 'Khan' adopted by Ganesh there is no dispute. The

by his panegyrist Krittivās was once very common for any powerful chief to secure. It is this title of "Gaureśwara" which is mainly responsible for the wrong surmise that Raja Ganesh was the patron of Krittivās. Thus Krittivās seems to have flourished partly in the 15th and partly in the 16th century.

Among those who believe Raja Kāṁsanārāyaṇ as the patron of Krittivās we may specially mention Mr. Kaliprasanna Banerjee and Pandit Rajanikanta Chakravarti; see "Madhya yuger Bāṅglā", pp. 11, 25, 26 by K. P. Banerjee and "Gauḍer Itihas," part II, p. 213, ed. 1909 by R. Chakravarti. See also the Introduction to the Descriptive Catalogue, Bengali MSS., C. U., Vol. I. But Dr. D. C. Sen is doubtful of this conclusion. According to him Kāṁsanārāyaṇ belongs to a later period than that of Krittivās. Kāṁsanārāyaṇ, he believes along with others, to belong to the 16th century.

genealogical list as given in Sadānanda-Kārikā is mentioned below :—



This genealogy is incomplete as it does not go to mention the names of the successor or successors of Ganesh Datta Khan and as such does not stand the test of sifting enquiry. The contention that no two “Gaureswaras” like Ganesh and Datta Khan were possible at the same date is baseless as this appellation was given by the court parasites in the past to any considerable landlord from whom they got any benefit of importance. To construct Śrī-Datta as Śrī Ganesh is only a favourite theory with Mr. Vasu which, we regret, we cannot endorse. Incidentally let us mention that Durgachandra Sanyal quoted a few letters (pp. 78-82) of the family of Ganesh in which it was distinctly mentioned that Ganesh was a Brahmin, but, of course, where did he find those letters we do not know. Ganesh has long been regarded as a Barendra Brahmin and Zaminder of Bhāturiā Parganah (Dt. Dinajpur) who occupied the throne of Gaur by killing Sam-suddin II about which incident we sufficiently discussed hereafter. Besides the Datta Khan theory, Mr. Vasu has also speculated upon another person, Mahendra Deva. For many years Mr. Vasu constructed one theory after another about this Mahendra Deva. However, he has recently fallen in line with the numismatic evidence, and we are happy

to remark, that he at last believes that Mahendra Deva was neither the father nor the younger brother of Ganesh, but the son who is otherwise known as Jadu or Jitmalla and succeeded him to the throne.¹

[N.B. Besides the two names Danujmardan and Datta Khan we find another name Kāns used by Abul Fazel. The last name has been long ago put to the test of historical investigation and it has been finally accepted that Kāns is the variation of the name of Ganesh. Care should be taken not to confuse Kāns with Kamsanārāyaṇ, the Raja of Tahirpur, an influential Barendra Brahmin and Zaminder of North Bengal, who flourished about 150 years after Raja Ganesh.]

In discussing the date of Raja Ganesh let us first give the following genealogical table from numismatic sources.

Azam Shah (reigned 1392-1409 or 1410 A.D.)

|
Saifuddin Hamza Shah

|
Sihabuddin Bayazid Shah.


|
Alauddin Feroz Shah

But according to Rajanikanta Chakravarti, the writer of গৌড়ের ইতিহাস who follows Riyaz, Saifuddin Abul Mujahid Hamza Shah reigned from 1393 to 1402 A.D. He was followed by Samsuddin II whom Ganesh, the Zaminder of Bhāturiā in Dinajpur district, dethroned, or according to some, killed in 1405 A.D. and reigned as king till 1414 A.D. Samsuddin, writes Mr. Chakravarti, reigned only for 3 years 4 months and 6 days. This writer chiefly follows Riyaz. But he refers to a puzzle. The coin of Sultan Sahabuddin Abul Muzaffar Bayazid Shah does not contain the name of his father, as is the common practice.

¹ According to Mr. H. E. Stapleton Mahendra Deva might be a brother of Jadu.

Now, according to Rajanikanta Chakravarti and his authority Riyaz-us-Salatin, Saifuddin was followed by Samsuddin II, while according to the coins, Saifuddin was succeeded by Bayazid. The writer does not seem to be aware of the numismatic evidence and cannot definitely ascertain who was the father of Bayazid. Mr. Chakravarti surmises that Bayazid might have been Raja Ganesh himself. But he also quotes Blochman, who thinks on the contrary that Bayazid was only the nominal sovereign while Raja Ganesh was probably all-powerful in the state during his reign.

Another writer on the subject, *viz.*, Durgachandra Sanyal, in his বঙ্গের সামাজিক ইতিহাস gives the following genealogical list :—



According to this writer Nasaret, the son of Saifuddin by his second wife, was older than Azam, the son by his first wife. There was naturally a dynastic struggle which is described at length by the writer and in which, according to him, the Bhāduris (Ganesh's family) participated.

Sihabuddin Bayazid Shah was Samsuddin II (Iliyas Shah, the founder of the dynasty, being Samsuddin I) according to Minhazuddin's Riyaz-us-Salatin and R. Chakrabarti's গৌড়ের ইতিহাস, while Nasaret is identified with Samsuddin II by Durgachandra Sanyal. It has now been conclusively proved that Bayazid and Samsuddin II were one and the same person. Bayazid only adopted the title of Samsuddin II and was never known as Raja Ganesh. A curious episode

has been related by Durgachandra Sanyal following Riyaz that an influential Mahomedan Pir (Saint) invited Sultan Ibrahim, the ruler of Jaunpur, to dethrone Ganesh. The Sultan came accordingly. Ganesh, to appease both the Pir and the Sultan (Ibrahim) had converted his son Jadu to Islam and placed him temporarily on the throne by way of a political move. It attained splendid success; for the Pir was satisfied and Ibrahim left Bengal quite contented. In this circumstance Jadu reigned for only about two years while his father Ganesh re-occupied the throne in 1416 A.D. According to the writer of Riyaz, Ganesh died in 1418 A.D. If we give any credence to this theory then Ganesh could not have reigned in 1405 A.D. In the coins issued by Jadu or Jitmal as Jelaluddin we find the dates 818 Heg. and 819 Heg. (*i.e.* 1415 A.D. and 1416 A.D.) when he ascended the throne during the life-time of Raja Ganesh.

As regards the date of Ganesh opinions of a conflicting nature exist making the problem as hard as ever. The writer of Riyaz places the reign between 1405-1414 A.D. But Durgachandra Sanyal wants to put the date of his actual coronation at 1414 A.D. Blochman suggests; as mentioned before, that Ganesh was the real ruler of the state for a long time even before his coronation in 1414 A.D. In that case Saifuddin and Bayazid could not have reigned for a long time and the period of reign attributed to Saifuddin (1393-1402 A.D.) and accepted by Rajanikanta Chakravarti seems to be untenable. As for Alauddin Feroz Shah, it may be safely surmised that he was probably trying the issue with Ganesh for some time, without any success. Some would believe that Ganesh killed Ghyasuddin Azam Shah himself in 1407 A.D.¹ But from the coins we know that Ghyasuddin was living as late as 1409 A.D., and was succeeded by three generations of descendants. We are, thus, inclined to dismiss

¹ See বাঙ্গালী-ইতিহাস by Īshān Nāgar.

the theory with the remark that Ganesh was perhaps growing powerful even as early as the reign of Azam Shah.

From the maze of theories, stories, hearsays and other more reliable evidences (which are more or less fragmentary and numismatic and historical evidences) it is very difficult to disentangle proper history.

However, recent historical researches have enabled us to get some new light on the subject. Mr. H. E. Stapleton wishes to put the date of Raja Ganesh's enthronement at 819 Heg. or 1416 A.D., and according to this scholar, he reigned at most for 5 or 6 years only, while according to Mr. Nalinikanta Bhattacharya (his observations being based upon some coins) Ganesh could not have been on the throne of Gaur earlier than 817 Heg. (1414 A.D.) and could not have reigned after 821 Heg. (1418 A.D.; see প্রবাসী, ১৩৩০ সাল). So, these two scholars seem to have very little essential difference so far as the dates are concerned. These coins have been discovered in Maldah, Chittagong and in the locality of Subarnagrām. It is a significant fact that no coin in the name of Ganesh has yet been found. Many coins bearing the name of Danujmardan and dated 1339 *Śakābda* (1417 A.D.) and 1340 *Śakābda* (1418 A.D.) have been discovered.¹ If it is proved that Danujmardan and Ganesh were one and the same person then Ganesh was living and ruling as early as 1417 A.D. Again, according to R. D. Banerjee, Ganesh reigned between 1396-1415 A.D., being succeeded by Jadu. So no definite date for Ganesh can be obtained at this stage.

In spite of all our attempts to give different versions current about Ganesh and his contemporary people, and to

¹ Rajanikanta Chakravarti mentions one significant fact in his গৌড়ের ইতিহাস; it is, "অড়াকানরাজ গণেশের সাহায্য করিয়াছিলেন," etc. To corroborate this statement we find that a coin in the name of Danujmardan has been discovered which was minted at Chittagong. These go to prove at some length the theory that Ganesh and Danuj were one and the same person. See also in this connection in addition to Rajanikanta Chakravarti's history, Bhattacharya's 'Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent Sultans of Bengal.'

give a cogent version from amongst the conflicting theories, it may be said, that the political history of Bengal of this period is shrouded in mystery. No definite conclusion is safe at this stage of enquiry. Sufficient coins are not yet to be found, and these too, are sometimes manufactured by interested persons or parties, while the same may also be said with vehemence about the testimony of literature, specially the genealogical literature, covering any disputed period. However, the day may yet arrive when the coins and literature may both be profitably utilised to arrive at a safe and definite conclusion.

DAYĀRĀM'S SĀRADĀ-MANGAL

EDITED BY

T. C. DAS GUPTA, M.A., PH.D.

Introduction.

The chief excellence of this short poem consists in its containing some valuable information regarding the condition of education in Bengal during the 17th century.¹ Mr. Adams appointed by Government, two centuries later,² furnished a very valuable account regarding the condition of vernacular education in Bengal, specially in the primary stage. Systems change very slowly in this conservative country and the gap of a few centuries—say from the date of Dayārām to the period of Mr. Adams—may as well be left out of account. The manuscripts of Sārādā-mangal available to us do not seem to be much later than the time of the composition of the book. I shall try to analyse the qualities of the poem Sārādā-mangal from the background of the educational system prevalent in the villages of Bengal at that period.

The educational system then in vogue might be traced from the Hindu period; some changes and innovations were no doubt latterly introduced in process of time, but they were not such as to make any material difference. The present work shows the characteristics of the Sanskritic system and is essentially Hindu in character. There is no perceptible trace of Islamic influence in it.

¹ The date of the poem is a probable one.

² See Adam's Report on Vernacular Education in Bengal and Behar, submitted to Government in 1835, 1836 and 1838 with a brief view of its Past and Present condition, by the Rev. J. Long, Calcutta. Printed at the Home Secretariat Press, 1868.

The idea is derived from a Sanskrit maxim, found in the Panchatantra.¹ In this work we also learn that the proper age to begin education is five, and if it is delayed at all it should not go beyond seven years. Education has always been imparted in this country with a free use of cane and other varieties of punishment. The Froebel and Montessori method ordinarily known as the "Kindergarten," established some time ago in this country, was unknown but the result nevertheless was satisfactory. The community sanctioned these punishments and the list will be a long one if we mention all kinds of punishment here. In Sārādā-mangal we get only a few varieties such as :—binding and sitting on the breast of the pupil for a specified time.

We extract from the Calcutta Review, No. IV, p. 334, a description of 15 different kinds of punishment used ; these, however, are now gradually falling into disuse.

"A boy is made to bend forward with his face toward the ground ; a heavy brick is then placed on his back, and another on his neck ; and should he let either of them fall, within the prescribed period of half an hour or so, he is punished with the cane.

"A boy is condemned to stand for half an hour or an hour on one foot ; and should he shake or quiver or let down the uplifted leg before the time, he is severely punished.

"A boy is made to sit on the floor in an exceedingly constrained position, with one leg turned up behind his neck.

"He is made to sit with his feet resting on two bricks, and his head bent down between both legs, with his hands twisted round each leg so as painfully to catch the ears.

"A boy is made to hang for a few minutes, with his head downwards, from the branch of a neighbouring tree.

1

"অজাতমৃত্যুপুত্র মৃত্যুজাতৌ মৃতৌ বরম্ ।

বর্তমৌ স্বল্পদুঃখার বাবজীবং ভড়োদহেৎ ॥"—পঞ্চতন্ত্র, কথামুখম্ ।

("Of unborn, dead and illiterate sons, the first two are preferable to the last, because they bring only momentary sorrows for the parents, whereas the fool troubles them for the whole life."—Panchatantra.)

"His hands and feet are bound with cords, to these members so bound a rope is fastened, and the boy is then hoisted up by means of a pulley attached to the beams or rafters of the school.

"Nettles, dipped in water, are applied to the body, which becomes irritated and swollen; the pain is excruciating and often lasts a whole day; but, however great the itching and the pain, the sufferer is not allowed to rub or touch the skin for relief, under the dread of a flagellation in addition.

"The boy is put up in a sack along with some nettles, or a cat or some other noisome creature, and then rolled along the ground.

"The fingers of both hands are inserted across each other with a stick between and two sticks without, drawn close together and tied.

"A boy is made to measure so many cubits on the ground, by marking it along with the tip of his nose.

"Four boys are made to seize another, two holding the arms and two the feet; they then alternately swing him and throw him violently to the ground.

"Two boys are made to seize another by the ears; and, with these organs well outstretched, he is made to run along for the amusement of the by-standers.

"A boy is constrained to pull his own ears, and, if he fail to extend them sufficiently, he is visited with a sorer chastisement.

"Two boys, when both have given offence, are made to knock their heads several times against each other.

"The boy who first comes to school in the morning receives one stroke of the cane on the palm of the hand, the next receives two strokes, and so each in succession, as he arrives, receives a number of strokes equal to the number of

boys that preceded him, the first being the privileged administration of them all.”¹

First of all, the poem emphasises the need of education and on this point the value given to education verges on a prolific and exaggerated importance. It is said that the king preferred that his son should be killed before his eyes than remain illiterate as a permanent eyesore to him.²

One interesting point to note is that a Pathsala or school received both male and female pupils. Even a princess did not feel it beneath her dignity to attend it. The Pardah system was much in vogue and marriage of girls before puberty was not perhaps in existence as the cases of the five young princesses, daughters of the king of Vaideva, show. The young and beautiful princesses attended the Pathsala freely, met there a young man named Dhulā-Kutyā (the Prince of Sureswar used this *nom de plume*) talked with him and even went so far as to appoint him as their personal attendant. That young man, a staunch votary of the goddess of learning, condescended to hold this extremely derogatory post for pursuing his studies. Our folk-lore³ and evidences like those found in Sārādā-mangal show that sometimes boys

¹ Introduction (pp. 10-11), Brief View of the Past and Present State of Vernacular Education in Bengal by the Rev. J. Long, as contained in Adam's Report on Vernacular Education in Bengal and Behar, submitted to Government in 1835, 1836 and 1838. See also Calcutta Review, No. IV, p. 334.

See also বিক্রমপুরের ইতিহাস by Jogendranath Gupta, p. 333. See also Aspects of Bengali Society from Old Bengali Literature, Chapter on Education, by the present writer, pp. 139-140.

In these two works mention is made of punishments known as ত্রিভঙ্গী, নাড়ুগোপাল, বর্ধামুখো following Calcutta Review, No. IV and the report written above, together with some additional items of punishments such as, “কপাল চিরিয়া দেওয়া” (scratching the offender's forehead with sharp points of a paddy) and “putting the offending lad flat on the floor and then sitting on his breast.”

² See Panchatantra.

³ “উপরে বসিল দারি শুক নীচ নিল”—ঠাকুরমার ঝুলি, দক্ষিণারঞ্জন মজুমদার।

and girls read in the same school up to a certain stage and under certain circumstances.

Of course it does not show a very high standard of morality in the Hindu society of that period when we find the five princesses abducted by their supposed Guru. But the girls were more tempted by a spirit of adventure and desire of acquisition of knowledge than any love for the young man. Pursuit of knowledge attracted them to such an extent that they passed through great sacrifice and hardships for the attainment of their object.

Thus one prince was going to be killed by his own dear father and the five princesses courted infamy and hazarded everything dear to them to receive proper education as related in the story of Sāradā-mangal and this shows, no doubt, the spirit of the age and the fascination which learning had, at least for the people in the upper stratum of the Hindu society. However, in the story we learn, that the goddess Saraswati played a ruse with the princesses (Kālindi, Kiçori, Umā, Ramā and Bimalā)¹ and put her favourite prince Lakshadhar (or Dhulākutyā who was once in her bad graces) in the Guru's stead. This plan was successful enough to make the princesses the wives of the prince.

The poem Sāradā-mangal belongs to the category of Mangal-Kāvya, as its name indicates. A poem of this class is always written to extol a deity and preferably a female deity. The story develops round the central figure of a hero or heroine who is usually a votary of the particular deity for whose extolment the poem is written. The deity on his or her side becomes active in order to support and favour this votary, especially in times of need, sometimes in a way which will be questionable to the humblest of mortals. Such illustrations are more or less to be found in all Mangal-Kāvya

¹ Another name we get in the extracts of Sāradā-mangal (in the Typical Selections, Part II, C. U.). It is Bisākhā, daughter of the Pātra, or minister of the King of Vaideva.

whether written in honour of Chandi, Manasā, Dharma or any other deity. Among the Mangal-Kavyas, of course, voluminous poems have been written in honour of Dharma (male deity), Chandi and Manasā (female deities). Mangal-Kavyas in honour of the female deities Sitalā (the goddess of small-pox) Gangā (the Ganges), Saraswati (the goddess of learning) and the like are rather minor poems not possessing the importance of the three Mangal-Kavyas we have already stated and derive their importance from the description of the educational system that was prevalent in the days of Hindu rule and lingered till the early days of East India Company's rule with some tenacity. The goddess Saraswati was ever active to support and help her votary the prince Lakshadhar of Sureswar country. She was not favourable to him at first. But once he succeeded in winning her favour, she spared no pains to help him in times of need, true to the tradition of a Mangal-Kavya goddess. For her votary she built a hut in a wood and changed herself into an old Brahmin lady ; for her votary she even went so far as to allow herself to be bound in fetters by him. She served as a boatman and did many a mean thing to help him.

In translating and editing the work I relied on two sources (1) a manuscript preserved in the Calcutta University Library (C. U. MS. No. 3780) and (2) some printed extracts prescribed in the Typical Selections from Old Bengali Literature edited by D. C. Sen and published by the Calcutta University. The first two pages of the manuscript being torn I relied on the printed matter in translating the lines given here. However, for the last portion I shall have to fall back upon the manuscript again as the printed extracts are incomplete. The readings of the above two though different in many places on the whole tally in sense. Unfortunately I could not secure any other copy anywhere though I searched for them very hard. The C. U. manuscript, I regret to say, is also not complete as only "Dhulā-kutya's Pālā" is given there and,

moreover, I could secure very meagre information about the work and the poet. I quote a few lines from the "History of Bengali Language and Literature" by D. C. Sen (p. 368) about Dayārām and his Sāradā-mangal :

"The goddess of learning, Saraswati, was not without her votaries among the early Bengali poets. Of the numerous poems which glorify her, one by Dayārām Das displays some poetic skill. The book is divided into seventeen cantos and tells an animated story describing how by the grace of the goddess one might achieve scholarship without much study. Dayārām was an inhabitant of the village of Kiṣar-chowk in Pargana Kaṣigaon in the District of Midnapore."

Unfortunately the manuscript from which extracts in the Typical Selections are taken has not been found and my efforts to find it has been up till now without any success.

I hope, inspite of all the above shortcomings the little work will yet be of some interest to the readers.

The Story (of Sāradā-mangal).

There was a country called Sureswar the name of whose king was Subahu. He was a very illustrious ruler known for the integrity of his character and valour. But unfortunately he had no son. After passing through much penance for a very long period, to propitiate the god Siva, the king at last was blessed with a son. The name of this prince was Lakshadhar. In due course the prince grew up and attained that age when one is to begin education. The charge of educating him fell to the hands of Pandit Gauridas who was also the king's family-priest. As ill luck would have it, the prince could learn nothing, not even the alphabet inspite of all attempts on the part of the Pandit to initiate him into the mysteries of the Bengali alphabet. Coercion was freely employed while the prince also tried his utmost to master the alphabet but to no avail. No, not even twelve years of hard work on the part of both the teacher and the taught could

avail anything. The mischance was due to some folly committed by the prince in his previous life. When at last the sad information reached the king, he grew furious and ordered his *kotowal* (the prefect of the police) to take the young prince to the execution-ground and there to decapitate him. Better to have no son than to have an illiterate fool as son that was the king's idea. The *kotowal*, however, could not be so severe towards the prince especially as the goddess of learning, Saraswati, whispered into his ears pleading for his life. So the *kotowal* let him free and showed the blood of a jackal to the king instead as a proof of the assassination of the unfortunate prince.

The prince after this incident fled to the woods and was wandering about when he suddenly saw a hut with an old woman as its sole occupant. She was no other than the goddess of learning herself in disguise. Here the goddess accosted the prince, sympathised with his lot and adopted him as her child.

Some time after this an incident occurred which gave a new turn to his life. The prince one day found himself alone; he heedlessly threw the sacred books of mother Saraswati into the water. The mischief was afterwards detected and the prince was subjected to hard punishment. He was bound hand and foot and severely flogged. At this stage the prince narrated his story regarding his futile attempts to acquire learning. This moved mother Saraswati and she divulged her identity. She instructed him to leave the forest and visit the Vaideva country where the king's five fair daughters were undergoing instruction at the hands of a Brahmin named Janārdana. The prince was instructed to do menial services for the fair ones, remaining incognito. He was to do this for four years after which he would easily master all the subjects for study. The goddess said that he was to pass through an ordeal of this kind as in his past life he had not paid the fee due to his teacher.

The prince met the princesses duly and sought service under them. They took pity on his sad condition and appointed him as a menial on a pay of one rupee and a half per month. The charges of board and lodging were paid from the state.

He was required to do three kinds of work, *viz.* :—

- (1) Cleansing and washing the school floor.
- (2) Kindling of lights in the evening.
- (3) Supplying sand and straw (or reed pen or chalk) for the princesses during school hours.

The prince agreed to serve on these conditions.

Some time elapsed in this way and the time for worshipping the goddess of learning came. The princesses made arrangements for the function with great *eclat*. They kept Dhulā-kutyā¹ (a name given him in contempt as he supplied sand and straw) to be in charge of the offerings. This required him to remain awake the whole night. He was keeping night for watch when at midnight he saw a woman suddenly appear there and eat the offerings. Dhulā-kutyā, greatly incensed, arrested the woman taking her for a thief and made a free use of his cane on her back. The goddess at this stage revealed herself to him and granted him the boon of mastering all learning without any further effort, and seemed to be well pleased with him for his faithfully performing his duty, though she was flogged by him. She then left him with her blessings on him.

In the morning the princesses arrived in the Pathsala and one of them, Umā, distributed the *Prasād* (remnants of the food-stuff offered to the goddess) to all. Of course, what transpired in the night nobody could know, as it was kept secret by the prince.

Now, one day the five princesses sat before their Guru to read. Their ornaments glittered in the sun. But their

¹ Sands were spread on the floor which served the purpose of a board. The pupils of the school in their early stages wrote the alphabet on sands with a straw or reed.

minds were not quite as bright as their ornaments. Their Guru lost his sense of duty as teacher and stood supplicant for their love. They complied with his request. The Brahmin Janārdan, their Guru, now made himself ready to elope with them to a foreign country, where he promised he would give the princesses the benefit of his entire scholarship so that they would become as learned as he. The difficulty on the way was loss of home-life with its great prestige. What will their parents, the king and the queen, say if they left them in that way? They would be subjected to a great scandal, bringing infamy on the royal family. That was the point they were revolving in their minds during school-hours. However, at last they made up their mind to sacrifice their reputation to get the grace of the goddess of learning, promised by Janārdan. They ordered a boat to be ready at night. Here the goddess Saraswati intervened again. She resolved to make all the five princesses her favourite's (Dhulā-kutyā's) wives. To effect this, she had to take recourse to a stratagem. She ordered the heavenly architect Viswakarmā to build a boat and create a river to elude Janārdan. These were done as wanted by the goddess and the princesses left their parents' palace in the darkness of night and reached this boat. Now, in place of Janārdan, the goddess Saraswati put Dhulā-kutyā by a stratagem which was as follows. She approached the old father of Janārdan in the guise of Dhulā-kutyā and divulged to him the plan made by this Brahmin teacher and warned him of the infamy and punishment that would inevitably be the consequence of such a course. On this the rage of the old Brahmin, father of Janārdan, knew no bounds. But hiding his rage he took recourse to a ruse. When his son was taking leave of his parents on the plea of going to a distant land on a priestly call, his father advised him to perform the worship of the god Vishnu first before he started. Accordingly as Janārdan sat to perform his worship his father put the door of the room under lock and key and thereby

imprisoned him. After this, the old man from outside, flung abusive words at his son as best as he could.

The goddess Saraswati, on the other hand, promised to her favourite prince Lakshadar (*i.e.*, Dhulā-kutyā) the hands of the five princesses¹ and a restoration to his former position. She made him occupy the place of Janārdan in the boat. The duty of the helmsman was performed by Saraswati herself. The boat started, and by the grace of the goddess reached a place in six hours which would ordinarily take six months. During the night he was not recognised but when the day dawned, the girls to their astonishment looked on the face of Dhulā-kutyā with great amazement and confusion. He was not Janārdan! The princesses blamed their sad lot and ultimately resigned themselves to their sad fate.

At this stage mother Saraswati appeared again before them in the guise of an old Brahmin lady and consoled the princesses as best she could quoting illustrations from the Shāstras. Finally she blessed for the girls' happiness in their conjugal life.

The princesses now intended to live with their husband Dhulā-kutyā and asked him to build a house for them to live in.² The prince now found an opportunity to repay, by a seasoned joke, the not very happy treatment he received at the hands of the proud princesses. So, he now informed them of his inability to erect any house for them. He was a mere servant and could not be an architect of a worthy mansion for the princesses. He demanded the wages that had fallen due to him up to then. This retort embarrassed the princesses a good deal. Again the goddess Saraswati intervened in favour of her dear votary. She appeared before him and told him to take

1 Among the five princesses is included one Bisākhā, daughter of the minister. So, it might have been only four princesses and one minister's daughter to make up the five, in C. U. extracts.

2 The custom of taking a number of wives was so popular that the poet did not feel any occasion to be apologetic when he made his hero marry a good number of wives.

courage. She would forthwith supply him with a good dwelling, which she did in the following manner.

The goddess Saraswati approached the chief Sādhu or merchant of the place, the grandson of Bejoy Datta. He was a god-fearing man and had great faith in the Brahmins. The goddess in the garb of a Brahmin approached him with a story and related that the king of Baidev was in great distress. Having suffered the frowns of misfortune the king had lost his kingdom and was living in the woods for twenty years. He was now seeking help from the merchant. The goddess added, "Will you kindly grant him the free use of your northern residence for only 10 days?"

Of course the merchant was too glad to help the king in distress and gave shelter to his family (*viz.*, the princesses and prince Lakshadhar) as requested.

Now, during this period Subāhu, the father of prince Lakshadhar, never enjoyed a bit of peace in his mind. He gradually experienced the bad grace of the goddess; of luck so much so that all his wealth vanished and his kingdom soon turned into a forest devoid of any human population. The king himself fell seriously ill, grew emaciated and became devoid of any physical strength. He was reduced to such a plight that there was no other help for him than selling his "Pakshirāj horse." It came to the notice of Dhulā-kutyā (Prince Lakshadhar) who reported to Saraswati about the horse. On this the goddess approached the king and bought the horse for a rupee only, to present it to the prince. The cured by horse was suffering from old age and gout both of which were the blessing of the goddess. The prince made a pilgrimage riding on the horse. He journeyed to eighty-four holy places in a second, such was the speed of the horse which travelled though the air.

The king Subāhu who witnessed this miracle was simply charmed. He, of his own accord, wished to give up his sovereignty and bequeathed his kingdom to the favourite son

of the goddess of learning who was still there in the guise of a Brahmin lady.

The goddess indicated her favour by a smile, which acted as a healing balm restoring the kingdom to its flourishing condition. Jungles were cleared and money came to the coffers of the king in plenty. The disguised goddess then made a request to the king to give his daughters in marriage to Dhulā-kutyā. The king accepted the proposal of the goddess Saraswati in good grace, and in due course the marriage ceremony was performed with much pomp. The king and the queen were invited by mother Saraswati to favour her house with their presence. Then, other residents of palace were given due reception but the royal couple to their great annoyance and surprise were received in a stable. The goddess subjected them to a far greater indignity. A great number of curries were prepared and served to the guests in golden cups, but the royal couple were served in heavy and unseemly stone plates. The king, incensed at such a cruel treatment, did not show any courtesy or mark of recognition to his son and daughters-in-law.

The king on his return meditated on the ways of retaliation for the affront to which he had been subjected and invited the prince, his five wives and their mother (goddess Saraswati in disguise) to his palace and commanded the sentry to keep strict watch on them so that they might not flee at night. He ordered that in case of their flight, not only the culprit, *viz.*, the lady (goddess) but also the *kotowal* and the sentry would lose their heads. The goddess, aware of the foul intention of the king, requested the goddess of sleep to keep the whole palace in deep slumber. That was done and at the right moment she left the palace with her five girls. The king, in the morning, was highly enraged to learn what had passed in the night and ordered the *kotowal* to be beheaded. The *kotowal* was taken to the execution-ground when the goddess again appeared, described the whole life-story of the prince and the

princesses and ordered the king to save the life of the faithful *kotowal*. Her command was forthwith complied with, the prince and the princesses were taken back again and the worship of the goddess Saraswati was performed by the king with due pomp and ceremony. This propitiated the goddess and greatly pleased his subjects. Here ends our story.

N.B.—D. C. Sen mentions 17 Cantos. Calcutta University MS., however, though apparently a complete one, contains 15 cantos. Only the concluding lines seem to be missing in this MS. It has got twenty pages having eight lines in each page.

DAYĀRĀM'S SĀRADĀMANGAL

Translation—

I pray to mother Saraswati, the consort of the god Viṣṇu. Oh holy Mother, who rides on the bird Koel,¹ do please

বন্দ্যমাতা সরস্বতী বিষ্ণুর বরগী ।
কবিকণ্ঠে উড় মাতা কোকিল-বাহিনী ॥
আপনি কহিলে গীত করিতে রচন ।
অভেব মায়ের পদে করিলু স্মরণ ॥
হরেশ্বর দেশে হুবাছ নুপতি ।
দানে ধ্যানে যশে তার অগতে খেয়াতি ॥
বরকে যাতনা দিয়া জিনিল সংসার ।
অমর মল্লকে লোক মরে নাঞি আর ॥
ভুবনে বিদিত রাজা ভারত ভুবনে ।
যুদ্ধে পূর্বে জিনেছিল শ্রীকৃষ্ণ অর্জুনে ॥

¹ It is very peculiar that the bird Kokila or Koel has been described by the poet Dayārām as serving the purpose of “bāhana” or carrier of the goddess of learning, Śaraswati. Nowhere in the whole range of Bengali literature or elsewhere another example of it has yet been found. The bāhana of Saraswati, according to Devi-Purāṇa, is Haṃsa or the grey goose. Thus :—

“ততো দ্বোতিভবান্ শব্দঃ স্বশক্তিং কিরণোজ্জ্বলান্ ।
হংসশূন্যনাকুলো স্বকীর্যবুধধারিণী ॥”—দেবীপুরাণম্ ।

In the Deccan side, we find, difference of opinion exists. There, a peacock is considered as the “bāhana” of Saraswati and not a goose. I remember to have seen some old statues of the goddess riding a peacock. In the Purana she is described as riding a Śuka. As we see Koel performing the function of “bāhana” of Saraswati in the Sāradamangal (a belief certainly current in the Hindu community of Mediaeval Bengal) so in the Vedic age another peculiar fact is brought home to us. It was the sacrifice of the bird Sāri (of white colour) to the goddess (“সরস্বতৌ শারিঃ শ্রেতা পুরুষবাক্, সরস্বতৌ শুকঃশ্রেতঃ পুরুষবাক্ ।”—ঐতিহ্যীয় সংহিতা, ৫।৭।১২) Saraswati.

However, as Saraswati is the presiding deity of music, Kokila whose voice is the sweetest among birds is naturally associated with her. Though the goddess herself being of white complexion favoured white birds yet another form of her is of dark complexion (cf. নীলসরস্বতী). The bird Koel is of the same colour as that of Nila-Saraswati (literally Blue-Saraswati). In the Tantras two Saraswatis are mentioned, one is Nila-Saraswati and another is Pārijāta-Saraswati, besides the female deity Mātrikā-Devī who was also considered as Bāg-Devī or Saraswati. In Devi-Bhāgavata we find Saraswati has Śuka bird in her hand together with Vinā and books. Thus :—

“বহিঃশুদ্ধাং শুকাদানাম্ বীণাপুস্তকধারিণীম্ ।”—দেবী ভাগবত, ৯ ম স্কন্ধ, ৪র্থ অধ্যায়, ৪৬তম শ্লোক ।

condescend to manifest thyself in my throat (inspiring my voice). You (the goddess Saraswati) yourself commanded me to compose this song and so I resign myself to your feet.

Once upon a time there was a king called Subahu who ruled the country named Sureswar. The king had a world-wide reputation for charity and other virtues. He chastised Yama, the lord of Death, and freed this world from his jaws. So in that country of immortals people ceased dying. The king became well-known throughout India. He is said to have once conquered even Kṛiṣṇa and Arjun.

The king (Subahu) worshipped the god Śiva for a hundred years, observing fast all the time. This meritorious deed was rewarded by Śiva who granted him the boon of a son. The king called his son Lakṣadhar (lit. Possessor of a Lakh) as the sage Garga gave the name of Gobinda (lit. Possessor of cows) to Kṛiṣṇa. After the birth of the prince the ceremony of the sixth day was performed with much pomp by worshipping the goddess Ṣaṣṭhī. In due course, some time after the "rice-eating" ceremony was also performed. Eight ornaments¹ were given to the prince for his person, made of costly stones and diamonds with lockets. He wore besides tād and bangles on his arms. And thus in a princely style and befitting his status, the child grew up. In his boyhood the prince was allowed to play with other boys. When he was only five he was so restless that he never would sit quietly in the royal court for a few minutes. When his age was seven he still neglected his studies for which the king was so annoyed with him that he wished his death rather than he should remain an illiterate fellow all his

¹ "Aṣṭa-alankār" is a familiar expression in old Bengali literature, indicating eight chief ornaments. They consisted of kundal, tād, bāju, bālā, kinkini, nupur, beṣar and hār.

life. Pandit Gauridas was priest of the royal court, who advised the king on this matter (education of the prince). According to him, if a male child does not receive education, he is just like a Mālati flower which spends its fragrance in the wilderness coming to no good of the world. If the child does not get education in proper time, his youth, indeed the whole of his life, is thus spent and he is bound to come to grief later on. Oh King, why do you neglect the education of your son? His proper time to begin education is boyhood which is being wasted for nothing. When do you propose

শতক বৎসর শিব পুঞ্জিল নিরাহারে ।
 সেই পুণ্যে এক পুত্র হইল রাজারে ।
 লক্ষধর নাম হইল নৃপতি আপনি ।
 গোবিন্দের নাম থুইল যেন গর্গমুনি ॥
 বস্ত্রী পুঞ্জা কৈল তার বোড়শোপচারে ।
 অন্নপ্রাশন হৈল কথো দিনান্তরে ॥
 অষ্ট আভরণ কত দিল তার গায় ।
 পদক প্রবাল মণি হীরা সম্ভার ॥
 বাড়িল রাজার বেটা ভুজে তাড়ি বালা ।
 ছালা কালে বালক সঙ্গে করে খেলা ॥
 পঞ্চ বৎসরের শিশু ছেল্যে-বুদ্ধি ধরে ।
 কতু নাকি বৈদ্যে রাজ-সভার ভিতরে ॥
 সপ্তবৎসরে শিশু পড়িবার বেলা ।
 মরিয়া যাউক পুত্র পড়িতে করে হেলা ॥
 গৌরীদাস পণ্ডিত রাজার পুরোহিত ।
 নৃপতিকে কহে গিয়া বিদ্যার বিহিত ॥
 পুরুষ হইয়া যদি বিদ্যা নাহি পড়ে ।
 বনের মালতী যেন অকারণে মরে ॥
 আগে নাহি পড়ে পাঠ পাছু গুণিরা বিকল ।
 জীবন যৌবন তার সকলি নিফল ॥
 পুত্রকে পড়াইতে রাজা কেন করে হেলা ।
 শিশুকাল গেল পাঠ পড়িবার বেলা ॥
 রাজনীতি তাহারে শিখাবে আর কবে ।
 মূর্খের অনেক দেব আপনি পাইবে ॥
 শুনিয়া বিজের বাক্য হুবাং নৃপতি ।
 পুস্তককণ্ঠে জ্বলেন দেবী সরস্বতী ॥

to teach him the principles of Politics? Will it not be too late hereafter (for there is a season for everything)? He will gradually acquire those vices, natural to an illiterate man.

King Subahu listened to the advice of the Brahman and worshipped the goddess Saraswati on an auspicious day. Moog (a kind of peas), banana, paniphal, atap rice, jarful of sugar and other offerings, in observance of 16 necessary rituals, were placed before the goddess. The function was attended with the play of Mridanga, Mandirā and other musical instrument. The king gave to the priest (over and above his fee) a piece of silk cloth and "Pāmari" and then put his son under his charge (the priest being also the Pandit). He was required to educate the prince in all the four Śāstras (here meaning languages) of Nāgri, Persian, Bengali and Oriyā. The prince was to be taught the lexicon of Amar and other writers(?).

Gauridas then took the prince with him and initiated him into the mysteries of the Bengali alphabet (lit. he first wrote

মুগ রস্তা পানীফল বোড়শোপচারে ।
 আতপ রশাল চিনি বিশাল^১ ভারে ॥
 নানামত নৈবেদ্য সকল সমুদায় ।
 মুদঙ্গ মলিরা বাজে মন্দ মন্দ বায় ॥
 পাটবস্ত্র পামরি দিলেন পুরোহিতে ।
 পুত্রকে সঁপিরা দিল পণ্ডিতের হাতে ॥
 চারিশাল সমুদায় পড়াবে সকল ।
 নাগরী ফারসী কিবা বান্ধালা উৎকল ॥
 অমর ছমর শব্দ শিখাবে কুণ্ডরে ।
 এহার অধিক যদি শিখাইতে পারে ॥
 এত বলি গৌরীদাস লইয়া কুণ্ডরে ।
 ক খ ফলা লেখিয়া ঋড়ি নিল করে ॥
 পড়রে রাজার বেটা বেত দিল হাতে ।
 কান্দিতে লাগিল শিশু গুরুর সাক্ষাতে ॥
 করে ধর্যা কর্যা দেই বিছাইয়া ধূলা ।
 একটা অক্ষর লেখ্যা দিলেন ক-ফলা ॥

অমর ছমর শব্দ—?

^১ বিশ—ওজন-বিশেষ ।

the Bengali alphabet “Ka” and “Kha”) and then put a piece of chalk or “Khaḍi” into the hand of his pupil to write with. The teacher with a cane in hand then asked him to read, but the pupil began to weep in presence of his teacher. He (the teacher) spread some dust on the floor, wrote the letter “Ka” (the first Bengali letter) on it and took the hand of his pupil in his own and helped him to draw the lines again and again round those he had written himself. In spite of his attempt he could not teach the prince to write even this first letter of Bengali and the teacher being angry gave him a sound beating. Not only that, sometimes he bound the boy with rope and at others he sat on the boy’s chest putting his whole weight on his slender body. In previous birth the prince had not paid his teacher’s fees on finishing his studies.

লিখিতে না পারে ততু শিখাইতে না পারে ।

মারিমা বেতের বাড়িএ বৈখা করে ।

কতু কতু বেছা রাখে বকে বস্ত্র রয় ।

উচিত করয়ে শাস্তি যে দিন যে হয় ।

পূর্বেতে পড়িয়া পাঠ না দিল দক্ষিণা ।

অভাব করিল মাতা এত বিড়ম্বনা ।

দ্বাদশ বৎসর তার গেল এইরূপে ।

গুরু^১ বলে কি বোল বলিবো আমি ভূপে ।

দ্বাদশ বৎসর* পড়াইল দ্বিজমণি ।^২

ততু না করিল দয়া কোকিল-বাহিনী ॥^৩

দ্বিধ মুখে হুনিঞা পুত্রের এত কথা ।

রাজা বলে কোটাল কাটাআ মান মাথা ।

কেহ বলে কিছু নয় কপালের কথা ।

রাজা বলে মশানে কাটিয়া আন মাথা ॥

} N.B.—These two lines are found here in C. U. MS. No. 3780, in place of the two lines written within brackets below.

} N.B.—These two lines are not found in C. U. MS. No. 3780.

Additional Notes :—^১ দ্বিজ (C. U. MS. No. 3780).

* After the line commencing with গুরু বলে there were two more lines in C. U. MS. No. 3780; but unfortunately they are so torn and defaced that they cannot be quoted here.

^২ নৃপমণি C. U. MS. No. 3780.

Here after দ্বিজমণি there were two additional lines in C. U. MS. No. 3780 but the place being torn is reduced to half and so unintelligible.

^৩ কোকিল-বাহিনী=দ্রবস্তী। See first page of the translation.

This omission was punished in his present life by Mother Saraswati in the aforesaid manner. Thus passed twelve years and all attempts on the part of the Guru to teach the prince proved futile. He now began seriously to think as to what explanation he would give to the king. Long twelve years the Brāhman attempted to teach the prince, yet the goddess Saraswati did not show any sign of favour.

The matter being reported at last to the Durbar, diverse people passed various remarks. Some said that it was no fault of the prince but this was due to his ill luck. The king was not only mortified but lost his temper and in a hasty moment passed the order for his execution, saying (curtly) "I have no need of an illiterate son." So, the Kotwal (Prefect of Police) took the prince to the execution-ground and asked him to sit, with his face towards the east in order to dispatch him. The goddess Saraswati came to learn all that had happened to her votary. He, who hears this song and worships Sārādā (the goddess Saraswati), gets the privilege of sitting in the society of the learned. He, who hears this song, gets a male child if he has none, and becomes master of learning if he is not so.

মুখ পুত্রে আর মোর নাহি প্রয়োজন ।
 কোতোয়াল মশানে লৈয়া করিল গমন ॥
 পূর্বমুখে কুণ্ডরে কাটে নিশাপতি ।
 সেবকের সরণ জানেন সরস্বতী ॥
 এই গীত শেবা শুনে সারদাকে পুজি ।
 সেই লোক হুখে বৈদে পণ্ডিত-সমাজে ॥
 অপুত্রের পুত্র ঘটে নির্ধনের ধন ।
 অবিদ্যার বিষয়া ঘটে শুনে যেই জন ।
 দয়াদাস দাসকে ক্রম দেবী সরস্বতী ।
 হুঃখ দূর কর মাগো কুজান কুমতি ॥
 কোতোয়াল বলে শুন রাজার কুণ্ডর ।
 মরণ সাধ্যাছ তুমি মশান ভিতর ।
 রাজা বলে মশানে কাটিয়া আন মাথা ।
 কোন কার্য্যে পুজিলাম জগতের মাতা ॥

Oh goddess Saraswati, poor Dayārām Das (the poet) is addicted to wrong ways, being vicious and wicked, pray forgive him and give him your grace.

The Kotowal said, "Oh prince, you have yourself courted your death in this execution-ground. The king said, 'to what use have I worshipped the goddess of this Universe (meaning the goddess Saraswati) (if my son remains illiterate) so, cut his (my son's) head and bring it to me.' This shows that the consort of the god Viṣṇu (the goddess Saraswati) is ungracious toward you." The mother (Saraswati) then herself whispered to the ears of the Kotowal as follows :—

"Hear me, Oh Kotowal, this prince is yet a child by nature. His life can be saved if he is allowed to flee. I shall cut the head of a jackal and present that to the king (in place of the prince's head) to satisfy him. My son, you may listen to this advice of mine and act up to it."

অভেব বঞ্চিত তোরে বিষ্ণুর ঘরগী ।

কোতোয়ালের কর্ণে মাতা কহিলেন আপনি ॥

শিশু মতি শুন ওরে রাজার নন্দন ।

পালাইয়া যার যদি পাইবে জীবন ॥

} Omitted in C. U. MS. No. 3780.

Alternative reading after "মশান ভিতর" (in C. U. MS. No. 3780).

কোন কালে না পুজিলে কোকিলবাহিনী ।

অভেব বঞ্চিত তোরে বিষ্ণুর ঘরগী ॥

পালাইয়া জাহ তুমি পাবে প্রাণদান ।

ভূপতিকে দিবো লয়া কাটিয়া ঘ্রাল ॥

কুণ্ডর বোলেন তবে কথা নাহি আর ।

ধর্মপিতা তুমি মোর নিরশার ॥

(Unintelligible, torn.)

ভূপতিরে দিব আমি কাটিয়া শিরাল ।

এই কথা বলি তোরে শুনরে ছাওয়াল ॥ } Omitted in C. U. MS. No. 3780.

কুণ্ডর বলে তবে কথা নাহি আর ।

ধর্মপিতা তুমি লহ জীবনের ভার ॥

বনবাসে যাই যদি ¹ বাঁচার বিধাতা ।

হৃদয় তোমার গুণ শুন ধর্মপিতা ।

¹ C. U. MS. No. 3780 has "আমি ।"

(As this advice was communicated to the prince) he addressed the Kotowal, "Nothing can be better than this suggestion. You may accept the charge of my life as I take you now as my foster-father. If my life is saved by the device, I shall be under a deep debt of gratitude to you. I am going away to some wild country in exile but I shall requite my debt to you on some day in future." The child took farewell of the Kotowal and followed the forest-path. The saving of his life was to him just like rebirth from his mother's womb. He felt no thirst, no hunger and it was occasionally that he took some wild-fruits. Sometimes he took rest in mountain-caves but he was never hurt by the wild bears (who roamed there).

The misery of her votary (appealed to the heart of the goddess Saraswati) and she took up the appearance of an old Brāhman woman, made a hut in the forest and remained there.

বিদায় হইয়া শিশু বায় বনপথে ।
 পুনর্জন্ম হৈল বেন মায়ের গর্ভেতে ॥
 ক্ষুধা তৃষ্ণা নাঞি কভু মনে কদাচন ।
 কভু বন-কল পথে করয়ে ভক্ষণ ॥
 কখন কখন থাকে পর্বতের কোণে ।
 বনের ভঙ্গুক ছুঁঞে নাঞি তাকে ॥¹
 সেবকের ছুঃখ দেখি দেবী সরস্বতী ।
 বনেতে বাঁধিয়া কুঁড়ায় রহিলেন² তথি ॥
 বৃদ্ধ ব্রাহ্মণীর বেশে বসিয়া কুঁড়ায় ।
 সেই পথে কুণ্ডর কান্দিয়া হয়³ বায় ॥
 ব্রাহ্মণী দেখিয়া শিশু নোরাইল মাথা ।
 আশীর্ব্বাদ কৈল তারে বিহুর বনিতা ॥
 কি নাম তোমার কহ কোন দেশে যর ।
 কি কারণে বন-বাস করহে কুণ্ডর ॥⁴

1 বনের শাকল্য শিশু ছুঁএ না তাকে ।—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

2 C. U. MS. No. 3780 has বসিলেন ।

Lit. the god Vidhi writes the fate of every one on his forehead on the sixth night after one is born.

3 বেশে—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

4 কি কারণে কির বাছা অরণ্য ভিতর ।—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

In this guise she was sitting in her hut, one day, when the prince was passing by dressed in rags. Taking her to be a Brāhman woman, the boy bowed his head to her who (Saraswati—Viṣṇu's wife) in return blessed him. The old Brāhman lady (Saraswati) enquired, "What is your name, Oh boy, and where do you live? May I know the reason of your sojourn in the woods?" The boy replied, "My luck, Oh Mother, is very bad, so you see the mark of cane and ropes on my body. I wasted long twelve years of my boyhood in futile attempt to acquire learning, yet the goddess Saraswati did not show me any favour. Calling me an illiterate fool my parents ordered the Kotowal to kill me, who, however, (took pity on me) saved my life acting as my god-father. Will you enquire of me further? My one reply to you is 'fate is at the root of everything.'" The Brāhman woman then said, "Look to my sad plight, my darling. I took curd and rice on the marriage night, a course to which I was led by my evil fate. It is prohibited to eat curd and rice on the night of one's marriage and as a result my husband has forsaken me and left me in this wood. Now, I beg in the town and live a wretched life. However, in a lucky moment I meet you, darling, here, and from to-day you are my foster-son. Through your help, I shall now earn our living by selling wood in the market."

মার্যাছে বেতের বাড়ি বন্ধনের চিহ্ন ।^১

কুণ্ডর বোলেন মাতা কর্ষ বড় হীন ॥

শিশুকাল গেল পাঠ পড়িবার তরে ।

দ্বাদশ বৎসর দয়া না হইল মোরে ॥

মুখ্য বলে মা বাপ কাটিতে দিল মাথা ।^২

কোতোয়াল কৈল রক্ষা হৈয়া ধর্মপিতা ॥

কেবল কপাল মূল কি জিজ্ঞাস আর ।

ব্রাহ্মণী বলেন বাছা এই দশা আমার ॥

বিভারাত্রে দধি অন্ন করিলু* ভক্ষণ ।

সেই বাক্য ব্যর্থ নহে বিধির লিখন ॥^৩

^১ গারে কেন বেত বাড়ি বন্ধনের চিহ্ন ।—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

^২ মুখ্য বল্যা মা বাপ কাটিতে বলে মাথা ।—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

^৩ সেই কন্দদোষে কিবা বিধির লিখন—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

* করিলু=করলাম ।

From that time the child remained in the house of Sārada (goddess Saraswati), but owing to 'māyā' (divine illusion) he could not recognise the mother. The boy cut wood in the forest and brought them to Saraswati, who sold them in the market. In this way some days passed. One day the old woman went to the market (as usual), but the packet containing the Gītā and other holy scriptures were unheedingly left behind.

At that time (finding himself alone) the prince trembled in rage for his illiteracy and threw the books (lit. সহস্রপুরাণ?) into the sea (by way of hate and retaliation). The boy contemplated that these books were the cause of his life-long misery and felt greatly relieved by throwing them in a place beyond all chance of recovery. The gods (in heaven) witnessed this and were filled with surprise. They thought over the matter a little and sent down Nārada (the messenger-god) to the goddess Bhārati (Saraswati). The sage took the goddess to task as in the valuable packet the names of Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa were the most precious in the holy books. These were for ever lost in the sea. The goddess herself got down into the very depth of the sea and recovered the scripture. The god Kṛṣṇa commanded his follower Agni (the god of fire) to preserve the divine books. Dayārām, who lives in Kāśijod-kiśorchawk village, thus composes the story of Sārada.

বিভারত্রে নিবেশ নারীকে অন্ন খাইতে }¹
 শুভক্ষণে দেখা বাছা হৈল তোর মাঝে ॥
 সেই পাপে² প্রভু মোরে দিল বনবাস ।
 নগরে³ মাগিয়া ভিক্ষা বাঁচি বার মাস ॥
 আজি হৈতে ধর্মপুত্র আমার নন্দন ।
 বাগারে বেচিয়া কাঠ করিব পালন ।⁴

¹ Omitted in C. U. MS. No. 3780.

² পাশে—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

³ বাজারে—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

⁴ করিবো ভোজন—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

After recovering the manuscript from water, the consort of the god Viṣṇu (Saraswati) became extremely angry. She (the goddess Kokilbāhini) bound the lad Lakṣadhara and gave him a sound thrashing. The lad then said, "Oh god-mother what offence have I committed that you beat and admonish me thus. The whole world knows that when a mother beats her son even the god of death (god Yama) cannot prevent the course. (By way of explanation I should say that) when I went to study I (often) got beating, the mark of cane you may still see in my back. Yet fate denied me learning. What could be more inhuman than that even my father ordered my execution for my illiteracy. It is through sheer luck and merit of past life that the Kotowal acted as my foster-father and saved my life. The goddess of Learning is unfavourable, so how can I resist all these miseries of forest-life. So, the

দেই হৈতে আছে শিশু নারদার ঘরে ।
 মায়ায় মোহিত মাকে চিনিতে না পারে ॥^১
 কাঠ ভাঙ্গ্য আনে বনে বেচেন সরস্বতী ।
 এই মতে কতদিন করিল বসতি ॥
 আর এক দিন বুড়ি বাজারেতে গেল ।
 ভারতীর ভাগবত খুন্দী* পড়া ছিল ॥^২
 কুণ্ডর দেখিয়া বড় কোপে কল্মষান ।
 সমুদ্রে ফেলিয়া দিল সহস্র পুরাণ ॥^৩
 বার তরে বনবাদী জনমের মত ।
 জলেতে ফেলিয়া শিশু জলে উঠে কত ॥
 দেবগণ দেখি বড় হৈল চমৎকার ।
 নারদে পাঠায়্যা দিল করিয়া বিচার ॥
 রাখাকুণ্ড দুটি নাম নষ্ট হৈল জলে ।
 নারদ ভৎসনা করি ভারতীরে বলে ॥
 গুনিয়া মুনির কথা কোকিল-বাহিনী ।
 সমুদ্রে ডুবিয়া আনে শাস্ত্র পুথিখানি ॥

১ মায়ের সহিত থাকে চিনিতে না পারে ॥—C. U. MS No. 3780,

২ ভারতীর পুথিখন্ডি ভাগবত ছিল ॥—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

৩ সমুদ্রে ফেলিয়া দিল শাস্ত্র জে পুরাণ ॥—C. U. MS. No. 3780;

* খুন্দী=হস্তলিখিত পুস্তকের আধার ।

almanac, the chalk, the book-packet with all its contents and the cursed cane are positively an eye-sore to me and fain would I throw them into water (lit. lake) (to give vent to my hate) at the first opportunity. Lady, you are my foster-mother, you will be very sorry if I die, being ill-treated by you in this way for no real fault of mine.”

On hearing the boy, the mother Sārādā became again favourable to him and revealed herself to him. “Oh child,” said the goddess, “in your previous life you completed your study with the help of a teacher but did not pay his fee and thus you are reaping its consequence in the present life. There is a country called Baideva whose king is happy, by the grace of Kṛiṣṇa to whom he is devoted. He has got five daughters. These princesses—Kālindi, Kīśori, Umā and the other two read with Janārdana, their teacher. Go and serve them as a menial for four years. Thus all your sins will be expiated and you will acquire proficiency in all the Sāstras. Go and serve the

দেবতার পুথিখানি পালিতে কি করে ।^১

প্রসাদ ভঞ্জন কৃষ্ণ অগ্নির মন্দিরে ॥

সারদা-চরিত্র-কথা রচে দয়ারাম ।

বসবান কান্দিবোড়া কিশোরচক গ্রাম ॥

পানীতে তুলিয়া শাস্ত্র খুন্সী পুথি মহাসত্ত্ব^২

“ নিরন্তর বিষ্টর ঘরনী ।^৩

নারায়ণী লক্ষ্মী ধরে প্রহারেন বন্দী করে^৪

করিলেন কোকিল-বাহিনী ॥^৫

কুণ্ডর বলেন তথা কেনে মার ধর্ম-মাতা

কোন দোষে কর তিরস্কার ।

জননী বাহারে মারে যম তারে কিবা করে^৬

জানে এহা জগৎ-সংসার ॥

১ দেবতার পুথি খুন্সী বারিতে কি করে ।

২ পুথি খুন্সী মোক্ষিপত্র—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

৩ নিরন্তর বিষ্টর ঘরনি—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

৪ নিবন্ধেতে শাস্তি করে—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

৫ ক্রোধে মাতা কাপেন এমনি ॥—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

৬ তারে কে রাখিতে পারে ।—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

five girls as I bid you, said mother Kokilbāhini. On learning the above from the mother, the prince left the place and reached the land of Baideva. Dayārām Das, son of Prasād, thus composes and sings the name of mother Sārādā.

The child reached the country of Baideva, as directed by the goddess Sārādā, and met the princesses who were passing that way. One of the beautiful princesses asked the prince,

পড়িতে গেলাম পাঠ	পীঠে দেখ চিহ্ন ছাট
তভু বিদ্যা না হইল কপালে ।	
কোতোয়াল কাটিতে মাথা	কহিলেন মোর পিতা
কত দুঃখ কব পদতলে ॥	
কি কব দৈবের কথা	কোতোয়াল পুণ্যের পিতা
প্রাণ-দান সেই দিল মোরে ।	
পাজি খড়ি থুঙ্গী পুথি ১	পাপিষ্ঠ বেতের বাড়ি
পাইলে ফেলাই সরোবরে ॥	
বনবাসে দুঃখ	বিদ্যা মোর বৈমুখ ২
বনবাস বিদ্যার কারণ	
তুমি মোর ধর্ম-মাতা	মরিলে পাইবে ব্যথা
বিনা দোষে করহ তাড়ন ॥	
গুনিঞা শিশুর কথা	সদয় সারদা মাতা
সকলি দিলেন পরিচয় ।	
পূর্বের পাঠ পড়াছিলে	গুরুরে না দক্ষিণা দিলে ৩
অতএব এই দশা হয় ॥	
বৈদেব দেশের রাজা	হুখে কর কৃষ্ণ পূজা ৪
তাহার কুণ্ডরী পঞ্চজন ।	
কালিন্দী কিশোরী উমা	পাঠ পড়ে পঞ্চজন
বিদ্যাদান করে জনার্দন ॥ ৫	

১ পাজি পুথি বালি খড়ি—

২ বনবাস বিদ্যার কারণে ।

তুমি মোর ধর্মমাতা মরিলে পাইবে ব্যথা

মিনি দোষে করিলে ভর্জনে ॥—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

(In place of বনবাসে দুঃখ করহ তাড়ন ।)

৩ পূর্ব জন্মে পড়াছিলে, গুরু না দক্ষিণা পালে—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

৪ বৈদেব দেশের রাজা গদা করে শিবপূজা—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

৫ বিদ্যাদান করেন ব্রাহ্মণ ॥—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

“What is your name and where is your country?” The prince said in reply, “If there be any person who would appreciate real merit and engage me as a servant for mere food and lodging I can surely give a good account of myself by serving my master faithfully. I shall do any service as I shall be directed to do.” The five princesses became highly amused at this (queer) answer and replied thus sympathetically, “You are now in a very pitiable condition and your voice is very weak. We shall give you quite enough food and drinking water to save you from collapsing. Besides you will get five sikās (i.e., a rupee and a quarter) and clothing per month. Oh young man, you will have to do three kinds of work for us. You have to cleanse our school-room with a broom as well as spread disinfectant liquid over the area. Besides you will have to kindle the evening light for worship and finally you will supply us with dust (or sand) and a piece of straw (writing materials) during the time of our study.” The lad agreed to

হয়্য তার আজ্ঞাকারী থাকিবে বৎসর চারি
কহিলেন কোকিল বাহিনী ।
সর্বপাপ বিনাশিবে সর্ব শাস্ত্রে^১ বিদ্যা পাবে
সেব গিয়া পঞ্চ সীমন্তিনী ॥
শুনিয়ে মায়ের কথা কুণ্ডর বিদায় তথা
বৈদেব-মল্লকে আগমন ।
দয়্যারাম দাস গান সারদা মাতার নাম
বিরচিত প্রসাদ-নন্দন ॥^২
সারদা ম'য়ের কথা শুনিয়া কুণ্ডর ।
বৈদের দেশের শিশু চলে অতঃপর ॥
কথোক্ষেণে গেলা তথা রাজার কুমারী ।
কুণ্ডরে জিজ্ঞাসে কিছু ভূবন-স্থলারী ॥^৩
কি নাম তোমার কহ কোন দেশে ঘর ।
কহিতে লাগিল কিছু বৈদেশের কুণ্ডর ॥^৪

^১ বড়শাস্ত্রে—C. U. MS. No 3780.

^২ দয়্যারাম দাশে গান দেবী হইল অত্যাশ
অন্তে দিয়া অভয় চরণ ॥—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

^৩ কুণ্ডরে জিজ্ঞাসে তার পরিহাস করি ॥—C. U. MS. No 3780.

^৪ দুকর জুড়িআ তবে বগিছে কুণ্ডর ॥—C. U. MS. No 3780.

obey as directed with folded palms and from that moment he became a servant of the princesses. As the boy performs the three functions, *viz.*, (1) cleansing the floor with broom and liquid, (2) kindling of evening light and (3) supplying the dust and straw, all people nicknamed him as Dhulā-kutyā.

In this way the prince passed some days when the day for the worship of the goddess Sārādā came by. In the auspicious “tithi” of the Sree-Panchami, worship of the goddess is held by the good people with much pomp, once a year. The princesses also worshipped the goddess of learning (with much ceremony). There were the sounds of conch-shell, bell, Mridanga, Muhuri and other musical instruments and there were Ātap rice, jarfuls of sugar in “Visa” quantity, sweet vegetable roots and various other offerings inclusive of ghee, honey, resin (a kind of incense), light and sweet-scented sandal-paste. With sixteen kinds of offerings, mentioned in the scriptures (and with much ceremony) a brāhman (a priest)

এমন ভাগ্যবান কেহ ভুবনেতে থাকে ।

উদরের অন্ত্র দিয়া মোরে রাখে ॥ ¹

যে কৰ্ম করিতে বলে এই কৰ্ম করি ।

ত্রিসন্ধ্যা থাকিব আমি তার আত্মকারী ॥

শুনিয়া কোঁতুক বড় কল্যাণ পঞ্চজন । ²

কুমারে কহেন তারা করিয়া যতন ॥

বড়ই কাঙ্গাল তুমি কথার দুর্বল ।

উদর পুরিয়া মোরা দিব অন্ত্র ॥

মাস মাহিনা পঞ্চসিকা পরিয় অম্বর ।

আমাদের তিন কৰ্ম করিবে কুণ্ডর ॥

ছড়া ঝাটি সন্ধ্যা দিবে এই ছত্র সারা ।

ধূলা কুট্যা দিবে পাঠ পড়িবার বেলা ॥

যে আত্মা বলিয়া শিশু যুড়ি হুই পানী ।

সেই হৈতে চাকর রাখিল শীমন্তিণী ॥

ছড়াঝাট সন্ধ্যা দেই ধূলা কুট্যা রাখে ।

ধূলা কুট্যা বলা তাহে সর্বলোককে ডাকে ॥

মাসে পাচসিকা কড়ি পাবে তার পর ।—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

¹ উদরেতে অন্ত্র দিয়া পুষ্ট আত্মাকে ॥—C. U. MS. No 3780.

² কখন তার কথা না করি হেলন । শুনিয়া কোঁতুক বড় কল্যাণ পঞ্চজন ॥—C. U. MS. No 3780.

worshipped the divine mother on behalf of the princesses. The school (lit. Pāṭhsālā) contained a jar full of water and flower. Dhulā-kutyā kept guard over the offerings keeping up the night. The princesses commanded as follows—"For any loss or damage of the various items of offering for worshipping the goddess Saraswati and which we are keeping under your care—you should be responsible. If any of these be lost or missing your head will be cut off. Who does not know that the head of Mahirāvana (the Rākṣasa or Demon king of Pātāla or the netherworld) was cut off by the son of Pabana (Hanumān of the Rāmāyana epic story) ?

(To be continued.)

এই মতে কথোদিন আঁছয়ে কুঁড় ।
 মারদার পূজা হৈল কথো দিনান্তর ॥
 শুভ তিথি শ্রীপঞ্চমী সঙ্কসরের পরে ।
 মাধুলোক পূজ্য মাকে বোড়শোপচারে ॥
 পুঞ্জিল রাজার কস্তা পরম হৃন্দরী ।
 শঙ্খা বটী বাজে কত মুদঙ্গ মুহুরি ॥
 আতপতগুল চিনি বিশাশর ভার ।
 আতপ রমালাকল বত উপহার ॥¹
 স্নাত মধু ধূপ দীপ অগন্ধী চন্দন ।²
 বোড়শোপচারে মাকে পুঞ্জিল ব্রাহ্মণ ॥
 পাঠশালে পূর্ণিত হইল পুষ্প-বারা ।
 আগরণে ধূলা কুটী জেগে থাকে পায়া ॥
 নৈবেদ্য পূজার বিধি নানা দ্রব্য-জাতে ।
 নষ্ট হৈলে তোর মাথা কাটিব করাতে ॥
 প্রাচীন উপাখ্যান কেবা নাহি জানে ।
 মহীরাবনের মাথা কাটে পবন-নন্দনে ॥
 শোল উপচারে পূজা করেন ব্রাহ্মণে ॥
 পাঠশালে আগি ধূলাকুটা থাক তুমি ।
 রহিল সকল দ্রব্য ঘর বাই আমি ॥
 নৈবেদ্য পূজার বিধি নানা দ্রব্য জাতে ।
 নষ্ট হৈলে কালি মাথা কাটিবে প্রভাতে ॥
 অনিরূপ উপাখ্যান কেবা নাহি জানে ।
 মহীরাবনের মত কাটিবে মথানে ॥—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

¹ করিল পূজার বিধি নানা উপচারে ॥—C. U. MS. No. 3780.

স্নাত মধু পঞ্চায়ত অগন্ধি চন্দন ।

MAHĀRĀṢṬRĪ, A LATER PHASE OF ŚĀURASENĪ *

By

MANOMOHAN GHOSH, M.A.

Khaira Research Assistant in Linguistics, Calcutta University.

1. It is generally agreed that the various Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA.) dialects met with in literature are artificial literary languages based on some living speeches. Hence from the available specimens of these we learn Prākṛit and Pāli as they *should be according to the grammarians*, rather than as they *actually were spoken*. This state of affairs has rather complicated the question of their place of origin. We find, therefore, that Pāli which has evident characteristics of a Western speech has been assigned by the Southern Buddhists to Magadha which is in the Eastern part of India. The popular literary tradition of later times, connecting the principal Prākṛit (Pkt.) of Hemacandra (Hc.) and other Western grammarians with the Mahārāṣṭrī (M.), has appeared to some scholars to be equally erroneous. After a careful study of this question, it seems that we have sufficient data to accept the above view once for all. To discuss these will be the object of the present paper. Before beginning the discussion proper, it is however necessary to give a brief historical survey of the vicissitude under which the view has passed since it was first promulgated sixty years before the present time.

2. That the so-called M. did not take its name from the Marāṭhā country was suggested first by J. Beames. "It is

* Read before the Philological Society of the Calcutta University on March 2, 1932.

rather hasty," wrote this scholar in his *Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages* (Vol. I, London, 1872), "to assume that modern Marathi is the lineal descendant of the Maharashtri Prakrit..... Maharashtri and Marathi have little in common except the name" (p. 34). But R. G. Bhandarkar (afterwards Sir) in his *Wilson Philological Lectures* delivered in 1877 rejected such a view and accepted the words of Daṇḍin (D.) in the sense given to them by Eastern grammarians, and writers on poetics. This great scholar unfortunately did not give the question as thorough an attention as it deserved. He seems to have depended too much on what he considered to be the traditional view, and necessarily he has not done justice to the available data which might have given him a different view about the geographical position of the second Middle Indo-Aryan dialects (*vide Wilson Philological Lectures*, 1877, Lecture III : first published in the *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1887, reprinted Bombay, 1914).

3. Later on R. Hoernle also expressed a view similar to that of Beames, and tried to support it by different arguments. In his *Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian Languages* (London, 1880) after drawing up a list of different kinds of Apabhraṃśa (A.) dialects recognised by grammarians, he writes : "it will be noted that the (so-called) Mahārāshṭrī Prākṛit does not occur.....in any list of Apabhraṃśas or Vernaculars. This shows plainly that the Mh. Pr. was not looked upon as the vernacular of any people, and that it did not take its name from the Mahārāshṭra (or Marāṭha) country. Indeed, it is doubtful, by what right that name is given to the particular form of Pr. which commonly bears it" (p. xxi). Hoernle then tries to explain the traditional identification of the so-called M. with Pkt. by the hypothesis that the Eastern grammarians and their followers probably misunderstood the meaning of 'Mahārāṣṭra' in Vararuci's work (XII. 32). We shall later on see that this part of Vr.'s work is in all

probability spurious, and hence we shall have to assume that the misunderstanding occurred probably with regard to D.'s words about 'Mahārāṣṭra.' Hoernle tries to remove this misunderstanding by taking 'Mahārāṣṭra' in the sense of the 'Great Kingdom,' which he likes to identify with the Doab and Rajputana or the Indian Midland. Besides this, he attempted to give a sound basis to his conclusion by showing that on *four* out of *five* important morphological points the so-called M. or Pkt. agrees with Western Hindi the descendant of Śaurasenī (Ś.) and not with Marāṭhi " (pp. xxii, xxiii). But Hoernle's arguments do not seem to be beyond criticism at the present time when the Indian linguistic studies have made considerable progress. In spite of this, his suggestion, as we shall see later on, was a very important one. But Sir R. G. Bhandarkar did not take any notice of Hoernle's arguments and he printed his *Wilson Philological Lectures* in 1887 without discussing or even mentioning them.

4. The next scholar who had the occasion to touch the question was R. Pischel who in his Prākṛit grammar (published in 1900) dismissed summarily the view of Hoernle as wrong (p. 4). He accused there Hc. of an error for his deriving A. in general from Ś., for in that case the Marāṭhi language comes to be affiliated to the same (Ś). We shall see later on that Hc. scarcely merited the above criticism. Pischel however very boldly assumed that there was a M. Apabhraṃśa which gave rise to Marāṭhi of the present day (pp. 3-4). But Sir George Grierson in his review of Pischel's grammar expressed his opinion that the connexion between Mahārāṣṭrī and Marāṭhi had not been proved. There he strongly criticised Pischel's authority—M. Garrez who tried to prove the identity of M. and Marāṭhi (*Journal Asiatique*, 1872). The arguments of Grierson are as follows: "(1) Marāṭhī has a Gerundive in *ūn*, corresponding to the Māhārāṣṭrī *ūna*. True, but the same suffix appears in Oṛiyā (cf. *jā-unu*, having gone), which is certainly not derived from

Māhārāṣṭrī. (2) Marāṭhī has a feminine form of the Demonstrative and Relative Pronouns. True,—but so have Jaipurī and Mārwarī. [We may add that in S.E. Bengali of Noakhali and Chittagong the pronoun for the 3rd person has a feminine form.] (3) Marāṭhī has the emphatic termination *éch*, corresponding to Māhārāṣṭrī *chia*. True, but so has Chhatisgarhī spoken on the other side of India. Finally, Garrez quoted a number of words which are, he said, peculiar to Marāṭhī and Māhārāṣṭrī. It may or may not be true that they are peculiar to Māhārāṣṭrī, but it is certainly not true that they are peculiar to Marāṭhī. All that is true, is that Marāṭhī has a good dictionary while other Indian vernaculars have not. It is unnecessary to go into details" (*I. Ant.*, Vol. XXX, 1901, pp. 553 ff.).

5. But in spite of this excellent criticism which he offered to Pischel's thesis, Grierson himself failed to believe that Marāṭhī could have any origin other than Mahārāṣṭrī (*loc. cit.*). This however did not have any quieting effect on those who belonged to the school of Pischel. In a paper published within a couple of years Prof. Sten Konow came to the rescue of his *guru's* view and tried to prove the origin of M. and Marāṭhī from the same source, and was of opinion that M. had its place of origin in the country named Mahārāṣṭra (*I. Ant.*, Vol. XXXII, 1903, p. 180). But arguments advanced in favour of his opinion about the home of the so-called M. or Pkt. do not seem to be satisfactory. Prof. Sten Konow himself seems to have been aware of this; for no less than four times he invoked the Indian tradition the exact meaning of which, as we have seen, is a much disputed question. But, curiously enough, this opinion of Sten Konow appears to have strengthened Grierson in his belief about the connexion of the so-called Mahārāṣṭrī Pkt. with Mahārāṣṭra. Hence in the Vol. VII of the *Linguistic Survey of India* (Specimens of the Marāṭhī Language, 1905) he tried to refute Hoernle's view. But Dhakkī which he took then to be an *Eastern* dialect in the

course of his refutation of Hoernle's classification of the second MIA. into Eastern and Western, proving afterwards to be a *Western* dialect, the arguments of Grierson have lost all their force (pp. 5-6). Hence his assumption about the existence of M. as a vernacular of the Mahārāṣṭra, and the derivation of Marāṭhi from the same appear to be inconclusive. (In the *Wilson Philological Lectures* delivered in 1915, the late Mr. Harinarayan Apte followed the views of R. G. Bhandarkar, Sten Konow and G. A. Grierson about the origin of Marāṭhi. The work was published in Poona in 1922.)

6. Prof. Jules Bloch too, in his excellent work on the Marāṭhi language (1915) seems to have followed Pischel, Sten Konow, Grierson and Bhandarkar rather than Beames and Hoernle on the question of relation between Marāṭhi and the so-called M. or the Pkt. But, we are afraid, Bloch is no more successful than his predecessors in establishing a relation between the two. The arguments which he gives for proving the relation is that a great many words in Hc.'s *Deśi-nāma-mālā* belong to Marāṭhi as well as Gujarāṭi (*La Formation de la Langue marathe*, p. 32). This seems to be the least convincing. For Gujarāṭi, a phase of the Old Western Rājasthāni, as is well known, has been very much influenced in its formative period by the Ś. speech; for, the area in which the latter was spoken, was contiguous to Gujarat (S. K. Chatterji, *Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, p. 8). In the opinion of Prof. R. L. Turner, Ś. is the parent of Gujarāṭi (JRAS., 1916, p. 229). And the Marāṭhi-speaking area too had a long common boundary with the area of Rājasthāni and the Western Hindi. Under these circumstances Prof. Bloch's argument loses all its force if it had any. The vocabulary in question might have been drawn from the common source Ś., the language of the Indian Midland, which supplied the basis of culture in all matters all over the Aryan India. Hence, the assumption that there was any M. (the native language of the ancient Mahārāṣṭra) which was the

source of the present-day Marāṭhi seems to be very much open to objection. Prof. Turner however follows Jules Bloch's view about the origin of Marāṭhi though he admits the phonetic difficulty involved in the matter (*vide* JRAS., 1916, pp. 231-232).

7. In the Vol. I of the *Linguistic Survey of India* (Introductory) published in 1927, Sir George Grierson too has retained his old belief as regards the relation between Marāṭhi and the so-called M. which he still considered to be the ancient language of Mahārāṣṭra, but this time he seems to have given a new location to this country. Previously, in Vol. VII of LSI., he did not expressly say what region he meant by Mahārāṣṭra, and probably the present Marāṭhi-speaking tract of India was in his mind, or at least he was in no doubt about the matter then; but in the Vol. I of LSI., he applies the name Mahārāṣṭra only to a part of the Marāṭhi-speaking area; and, curiously enough, this part lies due south of the area where speeches directly descending from Ś. prevail now-a-days (p. 123). This location of the so-called M. by Grierson creates some doubt about the theory that Pkt. was the ancient vernacular of Mahārāṣṭra.

8. So much about the history of speculations about the place of origin of Prākṛit in the narrow sense of the term (*vide* § 1). We hope to discuss below some additional data as well as the older ones to arrive at a definite conclusion. In course of this discussion we shall have frequent occasions to refer to all second MIA. dialects collectively which are indicated by the term 'Prākṛit' in its wider sense. But to avoid any possible confusion we shall retain its abbreviated form (Pkt.) for the word in its narrow sense, while the wider sense will be indicated by 'second MIA.'

9. The earliest and the most important among the authorities on the strength of which Pkt. has been identified with M. are perhaps Vararuci (Vr.) and D. These two expressly mention a dialect named 'Mahārāṣṭri' or 'Mahārāṣṭr-

āśrayā bhāṣā.' Apart from these there are Eastern grammarians (all later) like Puruṣōttama Deva,* Rāma Tarkavāgīśa, Kramadīśvara and Mārkaṇḍeya who expressly deal with M. first and on its basis treat the rest of the dialects. Viśvanātha Kavirāja, an Easterner, also speaks of M. (*Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, VI. 159). But their authority is very much weakened by the fact that the Western grammarians like Hc., Subhacandra, Śrutasāgara * and the author of the *Vālmiki-Sūtras* do not mention M. in their works. As these latter authorities flourished mostly in an area where speeches descending from Ś. were spoken, they had greater chance of being correct observer of things, and the tradition represented by them seems to be more authoritative. Hence the identity of M. with Pkt. rests solely on the authority of Vr. and D. and for the ascertainment of truth this should be thoroughly scrutinized.

10. Vararuci in his Chapter XII has dealt with those points on which Ś. differs from M., and directed in the sūtra 32 there, that for remaining matters Ś. was similar to M. (*śeṣaṃ Māhārāṣṭrīvat*); but in none of his earlier sūtras has he named M. It is on the authority of later grammarians of the Eastern school mentioned above (§ 9) that one is to take Pkt. described in the first nine chapters of Vr. to be M. But, curiously enough, in X. 2, and XI. 2, Vr. mentions Ś. to be the original of Paisācī (P.) and Māgadhi (Mg.) respectively, though this Ś. is reserved for treatment in the final chapter. One does not understand why this grammarian thus referred to a matter which was still to be discussed; for, no grammarian has yet been known to have arranged his sūtras in such an unusual order. Indeed this strange phenomenon in

* I take this opportunity of offering my best thanks to Principal Vidhusekhar Bhattacharya of Viśvabhāratī, Santiniketan, who kindly lent me the photographic *facsimile* of the only MS. of Puruṣōttamadeva's grammar presented to the institution by the Nepal Government, and to Mr. Johan Van Manen, the Secretary of the Asiatic Society, Bengal, for allowing me to examine the MS. of Śrutasāgara's grammar in the Society's library.

the *Prākṛta-prakāśa* raises a doubt about the genuineness of its chapter on Ś. This doubt seems to be strengthened when we do not find any *vṛtti* of Bhāmaha on the same. Cowell's conjecture that such a *vṛtti* once existed but was lost may be dismissed for want of any evidence in its support (*Prākṛta-prakāśa*, ed. Cowell, p. 183).

11. But besides the curious position of the chapter on Ś. in the grammar of Vr. and the non-existence of a *vṛtti* by Bhāmaha on the same there is another important fact which increases the suspicion about its genuineness. This is the disorderly manner observable in the arrangement of the sūtras there. In Vr.'s chapter of Pkt. it is found that topics have been arranged in the following order :

vowels,	<i>anusvāra</i> ,
simple consonants,	gender,
combined consonants,	<i>kr̥t-</i> and <i>taddhitādeśa</i> ,
<i>sandhi</i> ,	declension,
miscellaneous rules about	<i>dhātvrādeśa</i> ,
<i>lopa</i> ,	<i>nipāta</i> .

But in the chapter on Ś. there is no such order. Sūtras treating the same topic have been put wide apart, it appears, without any advantage. Their order, when arranged in the manner of the topics in Vr.'s chapters on Pkt. will be as follows :

sūtra 6 (on a vowel);	sūtras 25 and 26 (on declension of <i>sarvanāmas</i>);
sūtras 3, 4, 5 and 31 (on simple consonants);	sūtras 21, 27 and 28 (on conjugation);
sūtras 7, 8, 22 (on combined consonants);	sūtras 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 (on <i>dhātvrādeśa</i>);
sūtras 9 and 10 (on <i>kr̥dādeśa</i>);	sūtras 23, 24 and 30 (on <i>nipāta</i>).
sūtra 11 (on declension of nouns);	

It is very difficult to believe that these sūtras on Ś., so badly arranged, are from the hand of Vr. whose sūtras on Pkt. are so systematically put together.

12. To get further light about the spurious character of the Ś. chapter of the *Prākṛta-prakāśa*, we are to divide the sūtras into two groups and to discuss their relation to the sūtras on Pkt. Let us take in the first group those sūtras giving rules identical to a number of Ś. sūtras of Hc.; and in the second group those sūtras which have no correspondence with Hc.'s Saurasenī sūtras. The first group contain eight sūtras which may be said to constitute the crucial characteristics of Ś. But of these eight, two are clearly superfluous and another also may be taken to be so. These are sūtras 21, 26 and 27. The sūtra 21 provides for the termination *-ssam* for the first person singular of verbs in their future tense and also for the optional lengthening of the previous vowel in such a verb, but the first part of the rule is available from the sūtra VII. 14 (*mināṃ ssam vā*). The sūtra 26 provides for the optional use of the termination *-ssim* in the locative singular of *sarvanāmas*, but this rule is available from the sūtra VI. 2 (*neḥ ssim mmi tthāḥ*). If the rule 32 of XII (*śeṣaṃ māhāraṣṭrīvāt*), has any meaning, these two rules are clearly superfluous.

13. The sūtra 27 provides for the exclusive use of *parasmai-pada* in verbs whether of active middle or passive voice. This rule does not stand the test of best usages; for, according to Pischel forms like *jāne* (=I know) are in plenty in Ś. of plays like *Sakuntalā*, *Mālavikāgnimitrā*, *Uttararāmacarita*, *Anargharāghava* and *Viddhaśālabaṇḍika*, etc. (*Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, p. 324). Even if believers in the genuineness of the Ś. chapter of the *Prākṛta-prakāśa* may try to dismiss the readings of these plays as corrupt, we may find the above rule useless or superfluous. Vr.'s silence has often been given a meaning; for he did never expressly forbid the use of dual number and the case-endings of the dative

(*sampradāna-kāraka*), though no one suspected their existence in Pkt. Might not his silence in the present case have been enough in a similar fashion? Thus it is perhaps not unreasonable to see in two different treatments of things the handiwork of two different authors. The sūtra 16 provides for the alternative termination *-ni* for *-i* (or *-im*) of Pkt. But this rule has been overlooked by Somadeva in his *Lalitavigraharāja-nāṭaka*; for he writes *khaṇḍa-ladduāim* instead of *khaṇḍa-ladduāni* (vide *I. Ant.*, Vol. XX, 1891, p. 206). This dramatist belongs to the first half of the 12th century and must have depended on grammars for his Pkt. It is perhaps not unreasonable to assume his acquaintance with the very old and famous grammar like that of Vr. But he seems to have followed Hc. rather than Vr. This probably appears to be detrimental to the authenticity of the Ś. chapter of the *Prākṛta-prakāśa*.

14. Of the remaining four sūtras 12 and 13 provide for the *ādeśa* of *bho* instead of the root *bhu* in all tenses except the future, and the sūtra 5 provides the termination *-ia* in the place of *-tvā*. As these three sūtras explain forms actually occurring in dramas, there seems to be a difficulty about them. But considering the general inadequacy of grammarians' rules in such matters, this difficulty is more apparent than real. Last of all comes the rule about the change of intervocal *t* and *th* in Ś (sūtra 3). This rule is far from being a crucial characteristic of Ś. The *ṛtvāddigaṇa* of II. 6 is its serious rival. Though commentators are silent on the point, this seems to be an *ākṛti-gaṇa*. In addition to this, there is the rule *ka-ga-ca-ja-ta-da-pa-vādinām prāyo lopah*. The word *prāyah* (=mostly) has been interpreted by some commentators (e.g., the *Mañjarīkāra*) as 'in cases where euphony demands it,' that is, at times there should be no elision of these sounds, which included *d*. From this we may gather that the intervocal *d* may stand in any word in Pkt. The

use of the terminations *-do* and *-du* (V. 6; VI. 9) and the existence of *idaṃ* and *etaḍ* (VI. 3) in Pkt. clearly weakens the current theory about the intervocal *d* in Ś. But from the drama fragments available in some inscriptions of the 12th and the 13th centuries it appears that in Ś. intervocal *d* is retained in verbs only. Hence we find *paṭṭhijjā* and *kijjā* in the Pkt. verses of Somadeva's *Lalitavigraharāja-nāṭaka* (c. 1200 A.C.) while the prose Ś. has forms like *āṇavedi*, *bhaṇedi* (*I. Ant.*, Vol. XX, 1891, pp. 205-206). And forms like *khivā* and *kahā* are available in Pkt. verses of Madana's *Pārijāta-mañjarī* (c. 1300 A.C.) while in its Ś. prose forms like *āṇavedi* and *bhaṇedi* occur copiously (*Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. VIII, pp. 104-114). But a form like *vahadi* is also available in a Pkt. verse of the above play (*ibid.*, p. 107). It is not known whether this is a mistake, and as such is to be ascribed to the engraver of the inscription in which the drama fragment occurs.

15. Hence, the characteristic signs of Ś. becomes restricted to only three, *viz.*, (i) the substitution of *bho* for the root *bhū* in all tenses except the future, (ii) the present participle in *-ia*, and (iii) the intervocal *d* in verbs. But these might be genuine Pkt. forms which became archaic and fell into disuse when the grammarians wrote their grammar of it. The forms in question however might have survived through some old manuscripts not accessible to the grammarians. The existence of an older type of MIA., unknown to grammarians, in the play fragments of Aśvaghoṣa makes such a conjecture quite plausible. Hence we may say that the Ś. chapter of the *Prākṛta-prakāśa* is not indispensable, and seems very much to be a later addition.

16. The spurious character of the Ś. chapter will be further revealed on an examination of the second group of sūtras in the same. These sūtras give rules which are not available in later grammarians like Hc. and others. On an investigation of the special forms sanctioned by these sūtras, it has been found that none of them

(nearly 25 in all) except 5 appears in the Ś. of old plays and 7 do not appear in any kind of second MIA.; while only 6 appear in the so-called Jaina Prākṛit, and 5 forms appearing in the Ś. of plays can be defended by rules of the Pkt. grammar. (Our authority in this matter has been the *Pāṇi-sadda-mahannava*, edited by Haragovindadas Trikam-cand Seth, Calcutta, 1923-28.) These results may justify us in taking the Ś. chapter of the *Prākṛta-prakāśa* to be a badly compiled set of rules added in later times to Vr.'s grammar.

17. After discussing the Ś. chapter of Vr.'s work let us come to D., the second great authority on the identification of Pkt. He says that *Mahārāṣṭrāśrayā* dialect is the Pkt. *par excellence*, and poems like the *Setubandha* are written in this language. But D.'s statements are far from clear. If his Pkt. is to be taken in the sense of M. then we have him classifying the second MIA. into six varieties : M., Ś., Gauḍī, Lāṭī, Bhūtabhāṣā (= Paisācī) and A. (*Kāvyādarśa*, I, 34-38). He very curiously defines A. as the speech of the Ābhīras, and includes under the term A. any speech that is not Skt. His classification of the second MIA. is indeed a very novel one ; for, he adds a new name Lāṭī, and omits Māgadhi from the list—unless we are to identify Magadha with Gauḍa. The omission of Cūlikā-Paisācī is also worth noticing. Probably on account of his peculiar ideas about different kinds of second MIA., Daṇḍī does not find any follower in this matter among later writers, either, of grammar or of poetics. Should we, under these circumstances, take D. as an authority on the question of identifying Pkt. with M. ?

18. After discussing the Ś. chapter of the *Prākṛta-prakāśa* and the statement of D., we find that it would not be safe to have any confidence in the former ; while the latter, too, is not dependable in the matter of deciding whether Pkt. means a native dialect of the country named Mahārāṣṭra (Mhr.). Now D. and Vr. failing to decide the matter, let us see if we can get any light on the problem from an enquiry into the early history of the country which is known at present as Mhr.

19. According to R. G. Bhandarkar, Mhr. takes its name from the Marāṭhā tribe (*Early History of the Deccan*, Poona, 1927, p. 23). But I. T. Molesworth is inclined to think that Mhr. "may mean the country of Mahārs," a tribe still known in the province, though now in a degraded position (Introduction to *Marathi-English Dictionary*, Bombay, 1857, p. xxiii). This apparently is more likely to be the true explanation of the name. (Cf. C. V. Vaidya, *History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, Vol. II, Poona, 1921, p. 260.) The lowly Gujars of the present day who gave their name to Gujarat and Gujranwala may be compared in this respect with the Mahārs. The same thing may be said about the Pūrṣ (Punḍras of old) who gave their name to the once flourishing city Punḍravardhana of ancient Bengal.

20. The earliest mention of Mhr. has been surmised in the inscription of cave-temples of Bhaja, Bedsa and Karle, which are usually assigned to 200 A. C., but there is a strong difference of opinion on the matter (*Archaeological Survey of Western India Reports*, Nos. 2, 10 and 14; R. G. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 19; *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. VII, pp. 44-50). But a surer reference to the name is to be found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (NŚ., Chowkhamba ed., Ch. XIV, 38) ascribed to Bharatāmuni and placed tentatively in 300 A. C. (P. V. Kane, Introduction to the *Sāhityadarpana*, p. xi); but M. does not figure in the list of dialects given in the NŚ. Vātsyāyana's *Kāma-sūtras* also mentions Mhr. Prof. Jolly placed the work in the 400 A. C. (Introduction to the *Artha-śāstra* of Kauṭilya, p. 29; H. Chakladar places Vātsyāyana in 300 A. C., but this seems to be too early by a century, *vide Journal of the Department of Letters*, Calcutta University, Vol. 4, 1921, p. 117). A similar reference to Mhr. occurs in the old Ceylonese chronicle *Mahāvamsa* placed generally in 500 A. C. (R. G. Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 19). This work mentions Mahārāṭṭha as one of the countries where Aśoka's missionaries preached. But curiously enough, inscriptions of this great monarch though they mention neighbouring countries, are silent about Mhr.

proper. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, a native of the modern Mhr. is for rejecting the testimony of the chronicle as unworthy of credit with regard to the history of Aśoka India (*Aśoka*, Carmichael Lectures, 1923, Cal. Univ., pp. 159-161). The fact that the chronicle in question was written nearly eight centuries after the time of Aśoka amply justifies Prof. Bhandarkar in his course of action. From the mention of Mhr. in the *Mahāvamsa* it may however be presumed that the country with the name of Mhr. existed probably in the early centuries of the Christian era. In the available records of the Guptas, however, we hear of no Mhr. The effort of V. A. Smith to identify the Devarāṣṭra of the Allahabad Pillar inscription with Mhr. does not stand the scrutiny of Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar (V. Smith, *Early History of India*, 4th ed., p. 301; *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. I, p. 254).

21. But, from about 600 A. C. we are on surer grounds about the existence of Mhr. For Varāha-mihira, placed by Kern in the first part of the sixth century, mentioned Mhr. (*Brhat-Saṃhitā*, X, 7; C. V. Vaidya on what authority, it is not known, seems to deny this, *vide* his *History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, Vol. I, pp. 64-65). The next mention of Mhr. is by the famous Chinese traveller Hiuen Ts'ang (629-645 A.C.) who recorded the power of Mo-ho-la-cha (= Mahārāṣṭra). In the inscription of Pulakesi II (608-641 A.C.) too, this country has been mentioned (V. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 14, 443; C. V. Vaidya, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 140).

22. From the seventh century onward, however, we very often hear of Mhr. but such information will be of scanty help for the present purpose. Whatever we have learnt of Mhr. up till now leads us to the conclusion that this country—originally a settlement of the non-Aryan Mahārs or Marāṭhās was one of the many parts of the Indo-Aryan colony of the Dākṣiṇātya or Deccan during the first five or six centuries after Christ, and played but an insignificant rôle in the history of India till the seventh century, when, under the

famous Pulakesi II it reached for the first time the pinnacle of its glory. The fact that the Mahārāṣṭra Brāhmaṇs and the Kṣatriyas are traditionally known to have come down mainly from the Indian Midland or its neighbourhood strengthens the above view.

23. If the dialect of Mhr. were at all raised to the dignity of a literary language for the whole of Aryanised India, that event had greatest likelihood of occurring in the neighbourhood of the seventh century. Such a view however deals a cruel blow to the antiquity of Hāla's *Sattasaī*, believed to have been composed in M. Dates varying from 100 B.C. to 100 A.C. have been suggested for Hāla, whose other names are Sātavāhana and Sātakarṇi (V. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 219, 220). But the available data may not probably permit us to accept such a date for the *Sattasaī*. Indeed, V. A. Smith, in pursuance of R. G. Bhandarkar's view, assigned this work to Sātakarṇi's time. But when one finds that this king's descendants like Gotamīputra (c. 102 A. C.) and Vāsiṣṭhīputra (c. 123 A.C.) use in their epigraphic records a language which belongs to the same stage of evolution as Pāli of the Southern Buddhists (D. R. Bhandarkar, *Asoka*, p. 204), one loses one's confidence in the above view. Besides this, there is the fact that Gotamīputra Śrī Yajña Sātakarṇi (c. 169 A. C.)—a successor of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śrī Palomāvi—in one form of his coins wrote his name in two ways : *Gotamīputasa Siri Jaña Satakanisa* and *Gotam(a)putasa Hiru-Yañā-Hatakanīṣa* (Rapson, *Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty*, London, 1908, p. 45. I owe this information to my teacher Prof. S. K. Chatterji). Now the second version of the monarch's name was evidently a dialectal form connected presumably with the province in which the capital of the Andhras was situated. The *h* of this dialect developed from *s*, gives this an appearance of the so-called M. But as the name 'Hāla' has not yet evolved from 'Sāta,' one cannot be sure of such an early appearance of the so-called M. Prof. Rapson has styled the dialect in

question as Drāviḍī (*op. cit.*, p. xx) and he seems to be right ; for the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, which knows of no Mahārāṣṭrī, recognised Drāviḍī as a variety of the second MIA. to be used in a drama (XVIII. 46). All these facts seem to be very hard to be reconciled with the popular belief that Hāla patronised the so-called M. in which the *Sattasaī* is supposed to have been written. To this should be added the linguistic miracle of the *Sattasaī* language coming into existence in the first or the second century after Christ. For, inscriptions of this period written in MIA. are all much behind the dramatic dialects like Ś. Thus the opinion of Weber who puts the upper limit to the date of the present text of the *Sattasaī* in the third century after the Christ seems to be beyond criticism (Preface to *Saptaçatakam des Hāla*, p. xxiii). The same remark applies to the view of Lacôte, who on different grounds puts the work about the same period (*Essai sur Guṇādhya et la Brhatkathā*, Paris, 1908, p. 30). Along with these views should be considered the suggestion of Jacobi that the author of the *Sattasaī* may be placed in the fifth century A.C. (*Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshtrī*, pp. xiv ff.).

24. All these discussions may be said to point to the conclusion that Pkt. is not to be identified with the so-called Mahārāṣṭrī or native dialect of Mahārāṣṭra. Now to get any further light in this matter we shall examine those authorities who have in any connexion spoken or given us ideas about the different classes of the second MIA. Though none of them mentioned the so-called M., we may get from them useful hints on the point. Aśvaghoṣa who has been placed in the second century at the latest does not probably use any M. At least M. does not occur in his recently recovered drama fragments. From an examination of the phonetic structure of his Ś., which is more archaic than the available Ś., it appears that the so-called M. was not yet born in Aśvaghoṣa's time. The NŚ. is probably the earliest work which names several kinds of MIA. (It may be assumed that the NŚ. uses the word

‘Prākṛta’ in the sense of MIA.) For example, it has seven *bhāṣās* (major dialects) such as Māgadhi (Mg.), Avantiṣā, Prācyā, Śaurasenī, Ardha-māgadhi, Bāhlikī and Dākṣiṇātyā, and six *vibhāṣās* (minor dialects) such as Śāvarī, Ābhirī, Cāṇḍālī, Śākārī, Drāviḍī and Oḍrī (XVIII. 45 ff.). The name of M. as we see is totally absent from this list. The fact that Mhr. has been mentioned in the NŚ. (XIV. 38) may be taken to mean that it formed a part of the Dākṣiṇātya in early times. The same state of affairs seems to have been remembered as late as the tenth century after Christ, when Rājasekhara in his *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* cites the name of Mhr. as a country in the Dākṣiṇāpatha or as the Dākṣiṇātya (p. 93). But this fact does not seem to help us in identifying M. with the Dākṣiṇātyā dialect mentioned above, Hoernle and Grierson recognised this long ago (*vide* Map II in the *Comparative Dictionary of Bihari Language*, Calcutta, 1885 : The period 500-1200 A. D. assigned to the conditions suggested should not be taken seriously, for the Prākṛit philology was then still in its early days—the chief point to be noticed here is that Mahārāṣṭrī and Dākṣiṇātyā have been differentiated).

25. Next comes the *Prākṛta-lakṣaṇa* of Caṇḍa. Its date is uncertain. But its revised form may be tentatively placed about 700 A. C. For Hoernle thinks that the work in its revised form is later than Vr.’s grammar (*vide* his Introduction to this, p. xxiv). This would place the present text of the work after 500 A. C. which is approximately Vr.’s date (*vide* S. K. Chatterji, *op. cit.*, p. 62). Besides Pkt., Caṇḍa names Apabhraṃśa, Māgadhi, and Śaurasenī. But as Ś. does not occur in the older version of the work represented by MSS. A. and B. used by Hoernle, it seems that the name Ś. is a later addition ; and the date of this addition may be said to be synchronous with the composition of the Chapter XII of Vr.’s grammar. And in the matter of having the treatment of Ś. last of all, Caṇḍa’s revised version is quite a peer of the inflated version of Vr.’s grammar. But let us not be

misunderstood. It is far from our intention to suggest that S. was a creation of the later grammarians. What we mean is that the possible interpolators, who were widely removed from the time of the original treatise, have misunderstood the position of different dialects which were in a state of flux and were probably never quite amenable to the discipline of grammar. A discussion on this point will be made in a later part of the paper (*vide* § 35). It will be sufficient for the present to remember that an early authority like Caṇḍa leaves us in doubt as to the identity of Pkt., though Hoernle would have us believe the same to be another name for the Ārṣa Pkt. or an old dialect which was the parent of the Ardhamāgadhī and the so-called M. (Introduction to *Prākṛta-lakṣaṇa*, p. xix). The Digambara Jainas have their canon in a language called by them Prākṛta, but they nowhere connected this Prākṛta with Mhr. (The writer owes this information to Śrīyuta Muni Jinavijayaḥ of the Viśvabhāratī, Santiniketan.)

26. The *Viṣṇudharmōttara* mentions (III. 3) besides Skt. two languages Prākṛta and Apabhraṃśa (Introduction to *Apabhraṃśa-kāvya-trayī*, ed. L. B. Gandhi, GOS., p. 96). This is probably much earlier than 628 A. C. (J. Jolly, *Hindu Law and Customs*, Calcutta, 1928, p. 65). The same number for languages is also to be met with in Bhāmaha's *Kāvya-lāṅkāra* (I. 16), and this author has been placed between 675 A. C. and 775 A. C. (S. K. De, *Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1923, pp. 45 ff.).

27. Rudraṭa, usually placed at the end of the eighth century or at the beginning of the ninth century (S. K. De, *op. cit.*, pp. 86 ff.), mentions besides Skt. four speeches—Māgadhā, Piśāca, Śūrasenī and Apabhraṃśa (*Kāvya-lāṅkāra*, II, 12). There is no mention of M. here.

28. According to Rājaśekhara (c. 1000 A.C.), the god of poetry has Skt. as his mouth, Pkt. as his arms, A. as his abdomen, and P. as his feet (*Kāvya-mīmāṃsā*, p. 6). Besides this, he once mentions Pkt. and *Bhūtavacana* meaning by the

latter term probably Paisācī (*ibid*, p. 33) and also speakers of the Māgadha-bhāṣā (*ibid*, p. 50). But with reference to the distribution of languages over India he mentions only Skt., Pkt., A., and Bhūtabhāṣā (*i.e.*, P.) (*ibid*, p. 51). The absence of Māgadhi from the list seems to be curious. But there is probably nothing to be astonished at this ; for Māgadhi might never have been the instrument of literary expression on any appreciable scale, with the exception that occasionally this language was put in the mouth of very low characters in a drama for the purpose of creating fun. Thus we see that the famous poet-scholar recognised only four kinds of second MIA.: Pkt., A., P., and Mg. The fact that the name Ś. does not appear in Rājasekhara's list appears to be rather strange, for, he himself has written one entire play in Śaurasenī. Whatever that might be, Rājasekhara does neither mention M., nor identifies Pkt. with the language of Mhr.

29. Dhanañjaya (c. 1000 A.C.) in his *Dāśa-rūpa* (ed. Hall, II, 60) has the following:

striṇāṃ tu prākṛtaṃ prāyaḥ śaurasenya adhameṣu ca ।
piśācātyantanīcādaḥ piśācaṃ māgadhaṃ tathā ॥

According to one interpretation, the first half of the couplet means that ' Pkt. is generally (to be the language) of women, and Ś. in the case of male characters of low rank.' This would make the number of dialects recognised by Dhanañjaya to be four: Pkt., Ś., Mg., and P. But it is possible to give another interpretation to the verse in question. According to the same, the verse means that ' the dialect used in case of women is generally Ś., and the same is prescribed also in case of male characters of low rank.' This would reduce the number of second MIA. dialects mentioned by Dhanañjaya to three: Ś., Mg., and P. This second interpretation explains facts much better, and is perhaps the true explanation of the passage. For Ś. is exclusively the language of women and male characters of low rank in all available ancient Indian

dramas. Besides the three kinds of second MIA., Dhanañjaya mentions some unnamed *deśa-bhāṣās*, probably A. dialects of different localities (*yad deśam nīcapātram syāt tad deśam tasya bhāṣitam*, *op. cit.*, II, 61a). This would make the total number of second MIA. dialects recognised by Dhanañjaya to be four. As we have seen before (§25), Rājaśekhara has the same number, though his names differ.

30. Bhoja (c. 950-1050 A.C.) mentions five kinds of second MIA., such as Pkt., P., Mg., Ś. and A. (*Sarasvatī-kanthābharaṇa*, II 9. 16). After Bhoja come Vāgbhaṭa I and Hemacandra. These latter two are contemporaries. Vāgbhaṭa I, the author of *Vāgbhaṭālaṅkāra*, flourished most probably between 1123 A.C. and 1157 A.C. (S. K. De, *op. cit.*, pp. 204 ff.). According to this writer on poetics, the number of second MIA. dialects used for literary purposes was three: Pkt., A., and *Bhūta-bhāṣā* or P. (II. 1-3). This number, which is less than that of three immediately preceding authorities is rather curious. Let us see then if Hc. will offer any help in solving this puzzle which is ultimately connected with the identity of Pkt. usually believed to be the native dialect of Mhr.

31. Hc.'s opinion about different kinds of second MIA. are to be gathered from his grammar as well as works on poetics and lexicography. In his grammar he discusses Pkt., Ś., Mg., P. (including Cūlikā P.), and A. In connexion with rules regarding the use of languages in *kāvyas*, Hc. says that besides Skt. there are three other languages, such as Pkt., A., and *Grāmyāpabhraṇśa* (= early New Indo-Aryan?). Later on he gives names like Pkt., Mg., S., P., and A. (*Kāvyānuśāsana*, KM. ed., pp. 330, 337 ff.). In his *Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi*, too, he gives an identical number (Introduction to *Āpabhraṇśa-kāvya-trayī*, p. 99). Besides these five, he mentions one *Pretamahārāṣṭrī* language (*Kāvyānuśāsana*, p. 339). This name is absent from his other works, and may, either be a misreading for something else, or may indicate a kind of P. current in Mhr. Apart from this, there is no mention of M. in Hc., and

the number of second MIA. speeches recognised by him are five or six, but he gives no clue about the identity of Pkt. commonly believed to be a speech of Mhr.

32. The *Vālmiki-sūtras* commented on by Trivikrama and others are in this matter in perfect agreement with Hc., except that it does not know of any *Preta-mahārāṣṭrī*. This sūtra work is probably not very widely separated in time from Hc.'s work (K. P. Trivedi, Introduction to Lakṣmīdhara's *Ṣaḍbhāṣā-candrikā*, Bombay, 1916, p. 14). Besides this, grammarians like Śeṣa-kṛṣṇa (Trivedi, *op. cit.*, p. 4), Śruta-sāgara and Śubha-candra, too, agree with Hc. in discussing Pkt., Ś., Mg., P. (+CP.), and A. All these names are probably posterior to Hc. Śiṃgabdhūpāla (1330 A.C.), a Southern authority, also agrees with Hc. in enumerating different kinds of second MIA. (*Rasārṇava-sudhākara*, Trivendrum, III, 297 ff.); and he, too, does not know of any M., even with reference to dramas. Mhr. being a southern province of India, Śiṃgabdhūpāla's ignorance about M. as late as the 14th century may be said further to strengthen our doubt about the identification of Pkt. with a speech having its origin in Mhr.

33. All the above evidence, positive as well as negative, may be said to show very clearly that whatever else Pkt. might mean, it surely does not indicate a speech that had its home and origin in Mhr. Now if Pkt. has no claim to Mhr. as its land of origin, to which part of India then should its origin be ascribed? To this question history and common sense will give only one answer, and it is that the Indian Midland was the original home of Pkt. This would bring Ś. and Pkt. very near to each other, and they may in fact be the same language, considered to be different by grammarians owing to the reasons suggested above. That the unnamed Pkt. of the Digambara Jaina Canon has a marked Ś. character may well support this view. But before finally accepting this, we have to explain on the one hand D.'s *Mahārāṣṭrāśrayā bhāṣā* and on the other hand the rise of grammatical rules

regarding Ś., which we have shown has the chance of being identical with Pkt.

34. A history of the rise of Hindustānī or Urdū, a form of which has another name as 'Dakhnī' (= the southern speech), may be said to give the true explanation of D.'s words about M.; for it is well-known that some kind of 'Khadrī-bolī,' a dialect of the Indian Midland in the New Indo-Aryan period, first cultivated for literature by North Indian immigrants in the Deccan, came later on to be known as 'Dakhnī,' or Urdū or Hindustānī. If the name 'Dakhnī' could have prevailed at the expense of the remaining two and the event of the rise of the language would have belonged to a dark period of Indian history, there might surely have occurred similar confusion about its place of origin. From the above parallel and the data in our hand, it may be possible to reconstruct the history of the connexion of Mhr. with Pkt. which was a Midland speech and was in all probability identical with Ś. The country named Mhr. originally inhabited by non-Aryans was in a later age conquered and colonised by the Indo-Aryans—Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas of the Indian Midland—who brought with them a MIA. speech. Possibly this MIA. came to be used in literature first in Mhr., and hence D. has justification in connecting Pkt. with Mhr. (This reconstruction and the analogy of Hindustānī has been suggested by Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterji.) But we have seen before that the language of Mhr. could scarcely have been able to gain a prestige all over Aryan India—if such a thing at all came to happen—before the 7th century (*vide* § 22); and hence in the statement of D., who was probably an inhabitant of Mhr., we may discover traces of some patriotic exaggeration. For the *Setubandha* mentioned by D. as an example of M. was composed in the 6th century in Kashmir, and the *Gaṇḍavaha* was composed later on in the Indian Midland. As the *Sattasāi*, assumed to have been the earliest work written in a speech

of Mhr., has not been mentioned by D. and we possess no definite knowledge either about its time or its place of origin, it may not modify the above opinion.

35. It is quite likely that D.'s probable patriotic exaggeration came in course of time to be accepted as truth by a section of his successors. The earliest victim to such an error was either the reviser of Caṇḍa's *sūtras*, or the author of the spurious chapter (XII) of Vr.'s grammar. On the authority of D., they identified Pkt. with the so-called M. and have felt embarrassed over the non-existence of a treatment of Ś. in the existing grammars. This feeling might have induced them to add a set of new rules to those works. It has been shown before that most of these new rules contain scarcely any information about Ś. which is not available in the rules on Pkt. or the supposed M. (§§ 12-15). To explain the rules which seem to be superfluous (§ 16), we may assume that the data on which the interpolator of Vr.'s grammar based his rules were of questionable accuracy: what he took as correct Ś. might in fact have been readings of some corrupt texts. In any case we may accept that the Ś. chapter of Vr.'s grammar is not earlier than Daṇḍī (c. 775-825 A.C.), and for aught we know it may have been composed somewhere in the 10th or the 11th century after Christ. Now after rejecting the spurious chapter of Vr. we can easily gather from his X. 2 and XI. 2, where he gives Ś. as the basis of P. and Mg. respectively that by Pkt. Vararuci means Ś. How, in spite of this, some new rules about Ś. gradually appeared in later grammars is a history by itself. The main lines of this history have been indicated above. It was probably the wrong influence of D. that brought about this unnecessary treatment of Ś. in the existing grammars.

36. The fact that the Eastern grammarians like Puruṣōttamadeva (12th cent.), Rāma Tarkavāgīśa (14th cent.), Kramadīśvara (15th cent.), and Mārkaṇḍeya (17th cent.), and writers on poetics like Viśvanātha (14th cent.) expressly

mention M. may be explained on an assumption that they were misled by the spurious chapter of Vr., as well as the statements of D.

37. Thus, we may conclude that Pkt., though it may be called Mahārāṣṭrī, for the sake of Daṇḍī, was not the dialect which had its origin in Mhr., and the geographical area with which it has any possible vital connexion is the Indian Midland ; and in fact it is the language of the Sūrasena region : and therefore this Pkt. may as well be called Ś. proper, while the Ś. with a slightly differing form available in old dramas represents an archaic or dialectal form of the same. The ignorance of the earliest grammarians about the latter kind of Ś. can easily be assumed, when we find that Aśvaghoṣa's Ś. was also beyond their knowledge.

38. The classification of the second MIA. by Rudraṭa and Dhanañjaya agrees remarkably well with the conclusion that Pkt. was nothing other than Ś.; for these authors know only Ś., Mg., P., and A. Rājaśekhara, though he does not use the term Ś., is also in agreement with the above view. He has four kinds of second MIA., such as Pkt., P., A., and Mg.; and the omission of the name Ś. on his part seem to strengthen our conclusion, though in an indirect manner. For Rājaśekhara scarcely felt the need of describing the too well-known standard Pkt. by citing its geographical affinity. The large measure of praise which he bestowed on the Midland and its language (to the latter he showed his regard by composing entirely in Ś. the *Karpūra-mañjarī*) leave us in no doubt about his attitude towards Ś. The view of Bhāmaha and the author of the *Viṣṇudharmōttara* who recognise only two kinds of second MIA. (Pkt. and A.) does not clash with our conclusion. The same thing may be said about the classification of Vāgbhaṭa I who has three kinds of second MIA. (Pkt., A. and P.). The omission of Mg. from the list may, as we have suggested before, be due to the fact that this dialect has never been used for polite intercourse or literary composition, except for creating fun on the stage.

A SKELETON GRAMMAR OF THE NOAKHALI DIALECT OF BENGALI *

By

GOPAL HALDAR

THE NOUN

INFLECTIONS

There are four inflectional cases, *viz.*, Nominative, Dative-Objective, Genitive and Locative. The other cases (Instrumental and Ablative) are formed with post-positions.

CASE INFLECTIONS

Singular.

Plural.

1. Nominative:

base, [-e], [-ǝ] :

[-ra], [-era] :

e.g., [ram, rame], [kǝttaǝ] ; [baura], [ramera].

2. Dative-Objective:

base, [-re], [-ere] :

[-go], [-ego], [-gore] [-ergore] :

e.g., [ramre, ramere],

[baugo, baugore],

[mare, maǝere] ;

[ramego, ramegore] ;

[tsaorgore], *LSI.*, V. i, p. 302 ; [eiarergore], *ibid.*, p. 302, beside

[tsaorergore] and [holargore], *ibid.*, p. 309.

3. Genitive:

[-r], [-er] :

[-go], [-ego] :

e.g., [baur], [ramer] ;

[baugo], [ramego].

* Cf. 'A Brief Phonetic Sketch of the Noakhali Dialect of South-Eastern Bengali', by Gopal Haldar, M.A., in the *Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University*, Vol. XIX, 1929, pp. 1-40 (Calcutta University Phonetic Studies No. 2).

4. Locative:

[-ə], [-t] :

e.g., [g'oro], [bait].

N.B. [-e] is added after nouns ending in consonants, and sometimes to those ending in the vowels [-ə], [-o].

CASE POST-POSITIONS

5. Instrumental :

[di], the post-positional ending, added after the noun in the Dative-Accusative [-(e)re] for singular and [-(e)go] for plural: *e.g.*, [ramere di], [baure di] ; [baugo di].

N.B. [di] < [diə] দিয়া of Standard Bengali = 'by.'

6. Ablative :

[ton] তোন, the post-positional ending, added after the noun in the Genitive with [-er]. Some inanimate nouns, however, take [ton] directly: *e.g.*, [g'orton], also [g'orer ton] ; [ramer ton] ; [bavar ton] ; etc.

N.B. [ton] < [*thon] < « sthāna ».

7. Dative :

(i) [lai] লাই, the post-position added after the noun in the Genitive with [-r, -er] : *e.g.*, [baullai < baur-lai], [ramellai].

N.B. [lai] < [lagiə] লাগিয়া, the Standard Bengali form, < « √lag- » — « lagna ».

(ii) [ton] তোন and (iii) [tai] টাই are two other post-positions, which like [lai] express the dative relation: *e.g.*, [baur ton (bautton) ki mone 'ওঁ কি বাউতোন (বাউর তোন) কি মনে 'অর ? = বাবুর কাছে কি মনে হয় ? 'what does the Babu think of it ?' [bauttai (baur tai) ekkan niśedon (nibedon) ase] বাউটাই (বাউর টাই) এককান নিষেদন আছে = বাবুর কাছে একটা নিবেদন আছে '(we) have a submission to make to the Babu.'

It is evident that the post-positions could not come directly after the words—they were invariably used with the genitive or dative-objective inflectional endings.

THE PLURAL

In the singular nominative or genitive the enclitic [-ga] is added after the word in affectionate consideration for animate objects, while [-ṭa] is added similarly for inanimate objects, or in slighting or contemptuous reference to animate objects: *e.g.*, [*rolaga], [rolaṭa], [gaṣṭa], [ramerga], [ramerṭa].

[-ra, -era] in the nominative and [-(e)go] in the oblique are the affixes for forming the plural of animate objects: *e.g.*, [baura], [ramera], [ramego], [baugo]. Inanimate objects sometimes form their plural with [guli]. But small inanimate objects when referred to with some consideration form their plural in [-gun] (which becomes in quick speech [-un]), [-gin] and [-gain] (LSI.): *e.g.*, [bōi-guli], [batti-guli], [rul-gun], etc.

[ḥogol] < sakala > is the most common word or post-position for forming the plural of animate objects, or of inanimate objects considered as animate: *e.g.*, [rola-ḥogol], [gas-ḥogol] = পোলা সকল, গাছ সকল.

[ḥob] < sarva > is not at all common. The most common device for forming the plural of animate and inanimate objects is to qualify the nouns with [ṇek], [b'out], and [koto], or with the numerals: *e.g.*, [ṇek manṣ] অনেক মানুষ, [b'out kota] বহুত কথা, [koto gas] কত গাছ, [vāts-tṣa > ḥāṣṭṣa] ফাঁচ-টেয়া = পাঁচ টাকা, etc.

How to form the plural of inanimate objects is a problem. There is hardly any pure dialectical means for the purpose.

CASE

1. Nominative:

Singular: (i) The base without any inflection: *e.g.*, [ram koil(o)] রাম কইল, কৈলো = রাম কহিল 'Ram said'; (ii) [-e]: [rame koil(o)] রামে কৈলো, কইল = রামে কহিল 'Ram said.'

Plural: (i) [-(e)ra]: *e.g.*, [rolara gesil] পোলারা গেছিল = ছেলেরা গিয়াছিল 'the sons went'; [ḥister h(ṣ)utera koil(o)] হেতের হ(ফু)তেরা কৈলো, কইল = তার ছেলেরা কহিল 'his sons said.'

* [ṣ] in this dialect in quick speech is most often reduced to [h]. (See *Brief Phonetic Sketch of the Noakhali Dialect*). This is to be kept in view wherever [ṣ] or original [p] is met with.

(ii) [-fiagol(e)]; e.g., [fola-fiagol (fola-fiagole) tsillai u'i koil(o)] পোলা-হগল্(-হগলে) চিল্লাই উডি কইল=ছেলেরা সকলে চোঁচাইয়া উঠিয়া কহিল 'the boys shouted out and said.'

(iii) [-e] for a class: [sagole ki na khað] হাগলে কি না খায় 'what would not goats eat?'

2. Dative-Objective:

Singular; (i) Simple base: [dzol khaium] জল খাইয়ুম=জল খাইব 'I shall drink water'; [moſa mar] মশা মার্ 'kill the mosquitoes'.

(ii) [-(e)re]: only with animate objects, and also with the direct object of the verb which has two objects: e.g., [ramere koilam] রামেরে কইলাম=রামকে কহিলাম '(I) said to Ram'; [fola hainre (hola-ainre) afkara dicca] পোলা-পাইনরে আফ্কারা দিচ্চা=ছেলে-পিলেকে আফ্কারা দিচ্ না 'don't give indulgence to the boys.'

Plural: (i) the base: [mas-gun loi dza] মাছগুন লৈ যা=মাছগুলি লইয়া যা 'take away the fishes with you.'

(ii) [-go, -gore] (not so usual): e.g. [baugo koilam] বাউগো কইলাম=বাবুদের কহিলাম 'I said to the Babus'; [baugo t̥a-gun di den] বাউগো টেৱাগুন দি দেন=বাবুদের টাকাগুলি দিয়া দিন 'give the money to the Babus'; [baugore koile-o l'ab nai] বাউগোরে কইলেও লাভ নাই=বাবুদের কহিলেও লাভ নাই 'no good speaking to the Babus.'

3. Instrumental:

Singular: (i) [-di], with or without the dative affix added to the noun: e.g., [ramere di ki'rben] রামেরে দি কি'রবেন?=রামকে দিয়া কি করিবেন? 'what will you do with Ram?'; [bilai di ki'al tsaf ʔað ni] বিলাই দি কি 'আল চাষ 'অয় নি=বিড়াল দিয়া হাল চাষ হয় নাকি 'can one drive a plough with a cat?'

(ii) [-e] (sometimes with animate objects or living beings other than men): e.g., [t̥a.ð ki na ʔað] টেৱাৰ কি না 'অয়?=টাকায় কি না হয়? 'what does not money do?'; [rele dzað] রেলৈ যায় 'travels by rail'; [k̥otað tuft̥a] কথায় তুষ্ট 'pleased with words'.

(iii) Simple base, in some rare cases: e.g., [bet mare] বেত মারে 'beats with a cane'; so also [suri mare] ছুরি মারে 'wounds with a knife', etc. Such words with [✓mar] have [di], the post-position, understood after them: but use of the post-position, e.g. [bet di mare], would make the sentences unidiomatic.

Plural : [-e]go-di]—only with animate objects: *e.g.*, [baugo-di kam korað] বাউগো দি কাম করায় = বাবুদের দিয়া কাজ করায় '(they) have the work done by the Babus.'

4. Ablative :

(i) [-ton], the post-position: *e.g.*, [ramer ton jam boro] রামের তোন্ শ্রাম বর = রামের থেকে শ্রাম বড় 'Ram is older than Syam'; [baitton iʃkul koddur ?] বাইত্তোন্ ইঙ্কুল কদূর ? = বাড়ীর থেকে ইঙ্কুল কতদূর ? 'how far is the school from the house ?'

(ii) [-e]: [baper mue huintsi] বাপের মুয়ে হইন্টি = বাপের মুখে শুনিয়াছি 'heard from the father's mouth'; [dzivað dzol aise] জিহ্বায় জল আইছে = জিহ্বায় জল আসিয়াছে 'the mouth is watering'.

5. Locative :

(i) [-e], generally with words ending in consonants, or in [ɔ]: *e.g.*, [maðe g'af kaðe] মাডে ঘাস কাডে = মাঠে ঘাস কাটে 'cuts grass in the field.'

(ii) [-ɔ] (<[ɛ] <[e]): *e.g.*, [histen maðo kam koraer] হেতেন মাড' কাম করের = তিনি মাঠে কাজ করেন 'he works in the field'; [ratro g'umað] রাত্র' ঘুমায় = রাত্রে ঘুমায় 'sleeps in the night'.

(iii) [-t], after vowel endings in general: *e.g.*, [huiʃa bait halai aisi] হু(ফ)ইসা বাইং হ(ফ)লাই আইছি = পয়সা বাড়িতে ফেলিয়া আসিয়াছি 'I have left behind pice (=my money) at home'; [mas d'oitto nodit gese] মাছ ধইত্ত নদীং গেছে = মাছ ধরিতে নদীতে গিয়াছে 'gone to the river to catch fish'.

(iv) Simple base: [koilkatta gese] কইল্‌কাত্তা গেছে = কলিকাতা গিয়াছে 'has gone to Calcutta'; [aidz aise] আইজ আইছে = আজ আসিয়াছে 'has arrived to-day'. Are these native instances of locative in the simple base, or have they been received in this dialect through the influence of the Standard Bengali? Cf. [kumillat gesil] কুমিল্লাং গেছিল 'had gone to Comilla', [bombait dz'a-z ase] বোম্বাইং জাহাজ আছে 'there are ships in Bombay', [aidzza (<adzika) kailla (<kalika), rorfiuka (<porfuka) gesilam] আইজ্জা (কাইল্লা ফরফ্কা) গেছিলাম 'I went to-day (or yesterday, or day before yesterday)'.

6. Genitive :

Singular : [-er] for words ending in consonants and in [-ɔ]; and in all other cases, [-r]: [ramer boi] রামের বই 'Ram's book', [mar kota] মার কথা 'mother's words'.

Plural: (i) [-go]: [maiago iʃku] মাইগাগো ইস্কুল = মেয়েদের স্কুল 'girls' school', [ʃolago lea-hora] ফোলাগো লেখাফরা = ছেলেদের লেখাপড়া 'boys' education'.

(ii) [-er] after the agglutinative plural in [-gun] or [-guli]: *e.g.*, [ʃul guner (guli) bitsi sara] ফুলগুনের বীচি ছাড়া = ফুলগুলির বীচি ছাড়া 'separate the seeds of the flowers'.

(iii) absolute use of the noun followed the gen. pl. of a demonstrative: *e.g.*, [gas iguner nam ki] গাছ ইগুনের নাম কি? = এ গাছগুলির নাম কি? 'what are these trees called?'; [mas figuner dam koto] মাছ হিগুনের দাম কত = সে মাছগুলির দাম কত 'what is the price of those fishes?'

Of. Marathi: «Śivāji yācē caritra» 'Sivaji his life, Sivaji's life.'

It might be repeated that the genitive affix is the basis of the Dative, Dative-Accusative, Instrumental and Ablative (and even sometimes of the Locative) cases: *e.g.*,—

(i) Dative: [ba:llai tsai] বা-ল্লাই (বাবার লাই) চাই = বাবার জন্ত চাই 'I want for father'.

(ii) Dative-accusative in [-re], [-go] etc. (see *ante*).

(iii) Instrumental: [ramere di loi aḥ] রামেরে দি লই আয় = রামকে দিয়া লইয়া আইস 'have it brought by Ram.'

(iv) Ablative: [maḍetton (<maṭher-ton) goru ainsī] মাড়েরতোন গোরু আইনছি = মাঠের থেকে গোরু আনিয়াছি 'I have brought the cattle from the field'.

7. Vocative:

(i) the word followed by [ere] for inferiors, [o:] for ordinary relationships, and [erio] or rarely [eriova] for respectful address. With the first one, and sometimes with the second, the word is lengthened with a final [-a] < -iā > < -ika >. There is epenthesis, if there is occasion for it. Thus, [ere ʔatsoinna], [o: ʔatsoṇ], or [o: ʔatsoinna]; [erio ʔatsoṇ mia], etc. = এরে হাচইলা, ও হাচন, ও হাচইলা, এরিও হাচন মিয়া 'O Master Hasan!', etc.

(ii) the word followed by [re (ere)] and [o'] to express the shades of meaning as above: [ʔatsoinna re], [ʔatsoṇ o'].

(iii) Simple names lengthened with [-a]: *e.g.*, [rama] 'O Ram!' [dzuṇḍa] বড়ুদা = বড়ুয়া, Calcutta Coll. [ḥṛodo] বোদো, [ʔatsoinna] 'O Hasan!' [ʔamida] 'O Hāmid!' etc.

PRONOUNS

Pronouns have similar case inflexions as the noun: *e.g.*, [āi] Nominative, [ār] Genitive, [āre] Dative-Accusative. It will be seen that the Instrumental and the Ablative are formed with post-positions as in the case of nouns: *e.g.*, [āre di] 'by me', [āṭṭai] [āṭton] 'from me'. The dialect possesses no Locative case for pronouns (contrast Standard Bengali [amate], [tomate], [tate], etc.—forms with [-te]), except those which are made with the post-positions [kase], [m'oidde], [ṭāi] after the genitive case: *e.g.*, [āṭṭai (<ār-ṭāi)], [ār-kase], [ār m'oidde] 'to me', 'in me'. Practically, therefore, the cases for pronominal inflexions are three: (1) Nominative, (2) Genitive, and (3) Oblique.

I. THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS

(a) First Person :

		<i>Nom.</i>	<i>Gen.</i>	<i>Obl.</i>
	<i>Sing.</i>	āi	ār	ā-
	<i>Pl.</i>	amra	aṅgo, āgo	aṅgo-

(b) Second Person :

(Ordinary)	<i>Sing.</i>	tūi	tōar	tōa-
	<i>Pl.</i>	tomra	toṅgo, tōgo	toṅgo-
(Inferior)	<i>Sing.</i>	tui	tor	to-
	<i>Pl.</i>	tora	togo	togo-
(Honorific)	<i>Sing.</i>	{ amne	amner	amne-
		{ anne	anner	anne-
	<i>Pl.</i>	{ amnera	amnego	amnego-
		{ annera	annego	annego-

(c) Third Person :

(Ordinary,	<i>Sing.</i>	fiste	fister	fiste-
masculine)	<i>Pl.</i>	fistera	fistego	fistego-
(Honorific)	<i>Sing.</i>	fisten, hstin	fistener	fisten-
	<i>Pl.</i>	fistenra	fistengo	fistengo-

N.B. An epenthetic [-i-], pronounced very short, is more usually retained in all the above third personal cases. Thus, we frequently hear [ʃeⁱte, ʃeⁱter, ʃeⁱtera, ʃeⁱtin, ʃeⁱten, ʃeⁱtener, ʃeⁱtenra], etc. Again, nasalization of the first syllable is also met with.

		<i>Nom.</i>	<i>Gen.</i>	<i>Obl.</i>
(Ordinary,	<i>Sing.</i>	ʃeti	ʃetir	ʃeti-
feminine)	<i>Pl.</i>	ʃetira	ʃetigo	ʃetigo-
(Ordinary,	<i>Sing.</i>	ʃei, ʃien	ʃiar, ʃisner	ʃia-
neuter or	{	ʃigun, ʃigin, ʃiguner		ʃigun-
inanimate)		{ ʃiguli, ʃigain		

II. THE DEMONSTRATIVES

I. The Near Demonstrative [eⁱte] = Standard Bengali [e, ei].

(Ordinary)	<i>Sing.</i>	e ⁱ te	e ⁱ ter	e ⁱ tere
	<i>Pl.</i>	e ⁱ tera	e ⁱ tego	e ⁱ tegore, etego
(Honorific)	<i>Sing.</i>	e ⁱ ten	e ⁱ ten ^{er}	e ⁱ ten ^{re}
	<i>Pl.</i>	e ⁱ tenra	e ⁱ tengo	e ⁱ tengo, -gore
(Ordinary,	<i>Sing.</i>	(e)ien	(e)isner	
inanimate)	<i>Pl.</i>	igun, igain etc.		

II. The Far Demonstrative [oⁱte] = Standard Bengali [o, oi].

(Ordinary)	<i>Sing.</i>	o ⁱ te	o ⁱ ter	o ⁱ tera
	<i>Pl.</i>	o ⁱ tera	o ⁱ tego	o ⁱ tego, -gore
(Honorific)	<i>Sing.</i>	o ⁱ ten	o ⁱ tener	o ⁱ tenre
	<i>Pl.</i>	o ⁱ tenra	o ⁱ tengo	o ⁱ tengo, -gore
(Ordinary,	<i>Sing.</i>	oien	oisner	
inanimate)	<i>Pl.</i>	ogun	oguner	

III. THE RELATIVE PRONOUN

[dzeⁱte] = Standard Bengali [ʃe]

(Ordinary)	<i>Sing.</i>	dze ⁱ te	dze ⁱ ter	dze ⁱ tere
	<i>Pl.</i>	dze ⁱ tera	dze ⁱ tego	dze ⁱ tego, -gore
(Honorific)	<i>Sing.</i>	dze ⁱ ten	dze ⁱ tener	dze ⁱ tenre
	<i>Pl.</i>	dze ⁱ tenra	dze ⁱ tengo	dze ⁱ tengo, -gore
(Ordinary,	<i>Sing.</i>	dzi ⁱ en	dzi ⁱ ner	
inanimate)	<i>Pl.</i>	dzigun	dziguner	

IV. THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN

[ke] = Standard Bengali [ke]

<i>Sing.</i>	ke	kar	kare
<i>Pl.</i>	kara	kago	kago
(Neuter forms)	ki	kier	ki

V. INDEFINITE

[keo] = Standard Bengali [keu]

keo	karo, karor	karore
-----	-------------	--------

VI. REFLEXIVE

[amne] = Standard Bengali [apni]

<i>Sing.</i>	amne	amna	amnere
<i>Pl.</i>	amnera	amna (amnago),	

To express the reflexive sense, [nidz] নিজ is more often used: *e.g.*, [amgo amna dzomi amne(ra) tsoi] আগো আমনা জমি আম্‌নে(রা) চই = আমাদের আপনাদের জমি আপনারা চষি (চাষ করি) 'we till our own land ourselves'. [amna] 'own' in plural sense, instead of [amnago], the expected form, is almost the rule, unless all confusion is stayed by the use of [nidz]: [amnago (annego) amna kam, amnego-e kaitte ?oibo] আম্‌নেগো আমনা কাম, আমনেগো-এ কইত্তে 'অইব = আপনাদের আপন (নিজেদের) কাজ, আপনাদেরই (বা নিজেদেরই) করিতে হইবে' '(it is) your own business, you will have to do it yourselves'.

Note. The above pronouns refer (unless otherwise mentioned) only to persons or personified objects. This dialect, unlike Standard Bengali, does not ordinarily possess any pronoun to indicate inanimate objects or insignificant animals (cf. Standard Bengali, [tʃa, ta, e, o]), the exception being the interrogative pronoun [ki]: *e.g.*, [ki ?oil] কি 'অইল = কি হইল' 'what's up?'; [ki deikli] কি দেইক্লি = কি দেখিলি 'what didst thou see?'; [kier bafa] কিয়ের বাসা? = কিসের বাসা? 'nest of what bird' or 'den of what (small) animal?'. The need for a pronoun indicating inanimate objects is met by the addition of [-ðen] < *khān < khaṇḍa, or by the enclitics [-ṭa, -ga] for singular

and [-gun, -gain, -guli] for the plural to the nominative forms of the foregoing pronouns. (For [fiɛn, ɪn, fiɪgun, ɪgun, etc.], see *ante*). Thus *e.g.*, the singular with the enclitics are :

fiɛita,	fiɪga,	fiɪda,
eite,	ɪga,	ɪda,
oite ;	oiga ;	oida.

Again, the nominative forms [fiɛi, ei, oi, dzɛi] are never used except as modifiers of nouns. The pronouns which can be used as modificatives of substantives are :

- (1) [fiɛi] : [fiɛi din] হেই দিন=সেই দিন 'that day'.
[boi fiɛn] বই ফিয়েন=সে বইখানা 'that copy of the book'.
[foia fiɪga] পোলা ফিগা=সে ছেলেটি 'that boy'.
- (2) [ei] 'this' : [ɛi-din, boi-ien, kutta-ɪda].
- (3) [oi] 'that' : [oi-din, boi-ɔien, kutta-oiga].
- (4) [dzɛi] 'that...(which)' : [dzɛi din, boi dzien, gasdziga, gas dz(ɛ)iɪda].
- (5) [ki, kon] 'what?' : [kon kam ? ki kam ?].
- (6) [konɔ] 'some' : [konɔ din] কোন দিন 'some day'.
- (7) [kisu] (neuter) : [kisu dziniʃ] 'some article'.

Pronominal Derivatives

I(a). *Adjectives of Quality or Manner* are formed with the help of the affix [-moto>-~oto] and [-mon>-on], added to the Standard Bengali nominative form of the pronouns [dʒe, e, o, ke], etc. Thus we have [dzɛmoto, dzɛ~oto], [tɛmoto, tɛ~oto], [fiɛmoto], [kɛmoto, kɛ~oto], etc., which are used adverbially as well. For example : [kɛmoto (kɛ~oto) kɔta kon ?] কেমনত (কেঁওত) কথা কন ? = কি মত (=কি রূপ) কথা কহেন ? 'what sort of talk you are talking ?'; [dzɛmoto (dzɛ~oto) kam kɔic:ʃɛn tɛmoto (tɛ~oto) h(ɪ)ɔl haisɛn] যেমনত (যেঁওত) কাম কইছেন তেমনত (তেঁওত) ফল হাইছেন=যেমন কাজ করিয়াছেন তেমন ফল পাইয়াছেন 'as you have worked, so you have got the fruit.' But among [dzɛon, dzɛmon], [tɛon, tɛmon], [fiɛmon], [ɛon, smon] and [ʃon, ɔmon], the transformation of the nasal [-m-] to a slight nasalization of the preceding vowel is more common.

These are again lengthened with final «-iyā» with consequent epenthesis and the doubling of the final consonant: *e.g.*, [dz̥əmuⁱˈnna], [fi̯əmuⁱˈnna].

(b) *Nouns and Adjectives of Quality*: *e.g.*, [fi̯ətə] ‘that much’; [dz̥ətə] ‘as much as’; [kətə] ‘how much’; [ətə] ‘so much’; [stə] ‘this much’.

II (a). *Adverbs of Time*: with [khəŋə] > [ən] added to the base: *e.g.*, [təˈn, dz̥əˈn, əˈn], ত’অন, য’অন, অ’অন=তখন, যখন, এখন ‘that time’, ‘the time when’, and ‘this time’, respectively.

[kəbe] is the only instance of [=be]; and [dzeʃum, fi̯eʃum], etc., are the pronominal bases with [ʃəməð > ʃum], meaning ‘time’.

(b) *Adverbs of Place* are formed with [khane] <«khaṇḍa» added to the pronominal base: *e.g.*, [fi̯isne, dzi̯ene, isne, ɔiane], etc. But [konḍai > kon-ṭhāi] is more common than [konane].

POST-POSITIONS

Some of the important post-positions are :

- (1) [-əri] < [kəri] ‘doing’ after the base—used with an adverbial force: *e.g.*, [dz̥or kəri] ‘forcibly’, [ki-əri] ‘by what means’. The [-k-] is not completely elided after consonantal endings.
- (2) [kase] ‘near to’, after the genitive to give a locative or dative-accusative sense: *e.g.*, [kar kase raiksətsʰ?] কার কাছে রাইকছʰ? = কাহার কাছে রাখিয়াছিসʰ? ‘with whom have you kept it?’ [bair kase-e khal] বাইর কাছে-এ খাল = বাড়ির কাছেই খাল ‘the canal is near to the house’.
- (3) [sara] ‘without’, after the nominative or dative-accusative: [t̥ui sara ke d̥zaiboʰ?] তুই ছাড়া কে বাইবʰ? = তুমি ছাড়া কে বাইবেʰ? ‘who else would go but you?’ ɔ̯[t̥are sara d̥zaito nə] তৌয়ারে ছাড়া বাইত ন = তোমারে ছাড়া বাইবে না ‘without you, none would go’.
- (4) [ton] ‘to’ ‘from’ (see above, under Case Post-positions): similar to (2).

- (5) [t̪āi] 'to' (see above). Similar to (2) and (4).
- (6) [-di] 'by', to denote the instrumental (see above).
- (7) [bade] 'without', after the genitive, to denote locative: *e.g.*, [tar bade] তার বাদে 'after that'. Similar to (3).
- (8) [bina] 'without'. Similar to (3) and (7).
- (9) [b'itre] 'within', used after the genitive to form the locative case.
- (10) [m'oidde] 'within'. Similar to (9).
- (11) [lai] < lāgiyā < lagna- > 'in connection with', hence 'for': after the genitive, to form the dative case.
- (12) [lɔ̃] or [lɔge] < lagna- > 'in connection with', hence, 'in company of'.
- (13) [huddai] = Standard Bengali [huddho] শুদ্ধ 'including', used generally after the nominative base to denote the dative of inclusion.

ENCLITIC DEFINITIVES OR NUMERATIVES

Those commonly found in the dialect are :

- (1) [-an] < [khan < khana] < khaṇḍa > 'piece', *e.g.*, [kaor-an] : কাওরান = কাপড়-খান 'the piece of = cloth'; [skkan kaor] একখান কাওর 'a piece of cloth'; [skkana] 'a little' is very common to express small quantity of any thing, *e.g.*, [skkana kharan] এককানা খারান = একটু দাঁড়ান 'wait a little'; [skkana dzol] এককানা জল = একটু জল 'a little water'. Is [kana] here from < kapa > 'pinch or particle'?
- (2) [-ga]. Definitive article expressing some delicacy of feeling for the person or object referred to, *e.g.*, [rolaga], etc. (See *ante*.)
- N.B. ODBL §512 derives [-ga] from dialectal [ougga] 'one'.
- (3) [dzon] : only with reference to human beings.
- (4) [-ḍa < -ḥa] is a definitive article like (2), expressing 'slightness', 'biggishness' or 'crudeness': *e.g.*, [rolaḥa] or [holaḥa] and [rolaga].

N.B. [-ḥu], another Standard Bengali definitive enclitic, is not native in the dialect; its work is done by [ga], [skkana],

etc: *e.g.*, [ɛkkana kharan] একানা খারান=একটু দাঁড়ান 'please stand (or wait) a bit'; [duga b'at] দুগা ভাত=দুটি ভাত 'a little rice'.

- (5) [-gas], equivalent to Standard Bengali « gāch, gāchā », is used with reference to thin, long articles, but has some peculiar uses as well: *e.g.*, [ɛk gas > ɛggas], [bɛt-gas].

THE NUMERALS

The numerals are almost uniform in the various Bengali dialects, only the variations in Noakhali Bengali from the Standard Bengali need be noted below. The difference due to epenthesis (without the later vowel modification in the East Bengal dialects) should be kept in view.

- (1) [ɛk] এক 'one': in composition also not much modified, *e.g.*, [skoɪf] '21'; [ɛ(k)ottirɪf] '31'; [sktsɔlloɪf] '41'; [ɛ(k)anno] [ɛkrɔntsɔf] '51'; [ɛkfoittɪ] '61'; [ɛ(k)attoir] '71'; [ɛ(k)afi] '81'; [ɛ(k)anɔbbɔi] '91'; [ɛkʃɔ] '100'; etc.

In compounds there is voicing of [-k] if a voiced consonant follows it, *e.g.*, [ɛg-bare < sk-bare], contrast Chittagongese [ɛbbare]; [ɛg-dom]; but [ɛk-sar].

[ougga] 'one piece', more common than [ugga < sk-ua], is interesting.

N.B. In ODBL. § 512 it is suggested that the [-gga] of [ougga] has given the enclitic [-ga]. (See above.) Then what about [rolaga, iga, figa], etc.?

- (2) [dui] দুই 'two'. Generally there is no contraction of the last vowel, nor any vowel-modification in compounds: *e.g.*, [dui dzən], [du rɔir], etc.
- (3) [tin] তিন 'three'. [tɛtallɪf] '43', [tɛppanno] '53', etc., show forms in [tɛ-], while [ti-] is also found: *e.g.*, [tirafi] '83', [tiranɔbbɔi] '93', etc.
- (4) [tsair] চার 'four'. Some peculiar forms are [tsoumuni < tsou-muha-ni] < « catur-mukha- » চৌমুনী=চৌমুহনী 'the

place where the four (heads of) streets meet'; [tsəd'ri] চদরী = চৌধুরী (< চতুর্ধুরিক) 'a surname, Chaudhuri'; [tsaiffɔ] '400'.

- (5) [fāts > hāts] ফাঁচ=হাঁচ=পাঁচ 'five'. Compositions with [fāts] are [hītsoif] '25'; [həntsaf] '50'; [f(h)aitirif] '35'; [f(h)āiffɔ] '500'.

N.B. Nasalization with [ɸ-] is rare, with [h-] almost universal.

- (6) [so] ছ=ছয় 'six'; [sɔtsɔllif] '46'; [sɔfɔtɔɪ] '(6)'.
 (7) [hiat] হাত=সাত 'seven'. [h- < ɸ-] is the rule, but careful speakers are going back to the original [ɸ-].
 (8) [aɪte] আটে=আট 'eight'. By voicing we have [aɪaro] '18'.
 (9) [noɪ] [no] নয়, ন 'nine'. [unnɔif] '19', etc.
 (10) [dɔf] দশ 'ten'.

No marked difference is noticed from the Standard Bengali forms in the tens, twenties, thirties, fifties, etc.; but [tsoutsɔllif] '44', [hāts-tsɔllif] '45', [sɔtsɔllif] '46', also [ɛk-fəntsaf] '51', are heard commonly. In computation, [kuri] কুড়ি 'aggregate of twenty' is popular all over Bengal. [ʔali] হালি 'aggregate of four', instead of [gɔnɔa] গণ্ডা, which is also current, is by far the most popular computation word in the Noakhali dialect. [dzɔra] ষোড় 'pair' is used for *dhoties* etc. and shoes, and [ɸon] পণ < « paṇa » 'aggregate of 80', for smaller fruits like nuts.

In the case fractionals the variations are still less: *e.g.* [ɸoa] পোয়া 'quarter', [ʔada] আধা 'half', [d'ɛr < dɛɸi] দেড় 'one and half', [arai] আড়াই 'two and a half', [ɸoa] সোয়া 'one and a quarter', [ɸone] পোনে 'three quarters', etc.

Ordinals are similar, too (if we leave out of consideration the differences due to epenthesis): *e.g.*, [ɸoila] পয়লা 'first', [dɔfra] দোসরা 'second day of the month' (but [dosra], with [s], from Hindustani « dosrā », is 'the second one,' hence, 'a different one'), [ɸatsɔi] পাঁচই 'fifth', [unn(ɔ)ifa] উনিশা, উনিইশা 'nineteenth', and so on.

THE VERB

The verbs in common use are much the same as those in the Standard Bengali Colloquial. They have in this dialect the same

tenses; but in conjugation, it is to be remembered that, they make a nearer approach to the *Sādhu-bhāṣā* forms rather than those of the Standard Colloquial or *Calit-bhāṣā*. In the latter, phonetic advance has gone far; while the *Sādhu-bhāṣā* forms are based on an old order in which the phonetic tendencies had not yet had their full play. In the Noakhali dialect also the tendencies are not much advanced; hence the closer resemblance of the conjugational form to those of the Standard Literary Bengali, i.e., the *Sādhu-bhāṣā*. It is moreover to be borne in mind that the verbs in common with other words have undergone the phonetic modification peculiar to the dialect, which have been briefly noted in *Phonetic Sketch of the Noakhali Dialect*. These are: (1) loss of intervocalic consonants; (2) assimilation of «rl-, -rt-, -rs-» etc. > «-ll-, -tt-, -cc-» etc.; (3) reduction of «-g/s-, -d/s-, -dz/s-» > -dz/z-; (4) of «-t/s-» > ts/s-; (5) of «-d/t-» > -dd-; and (6) of «p, ph» > f > h.

The following vowel changes in the roots through the influence of inflectional vowels are commonly evident.

(a) *Vowel Harmony*: (1) [ə/i, ə/u] > [ò/i, ò/u], e.g., [kəḍ, kə], etc., 'speaks', 'you speak', etc., but [koi, kouk] 'I speak', 'let (people) speak', etc..

(2) [ə/i|a > ò/i], e.g., [kori] করি = করিয়া 'having done'.

(3) u/ö, u/ consonant, u/o > o/ö, o/ consonant, o/o, respectively: e.g., [d'oḍ] 'washes', [d'on] 'you wash' (honorific), [d'o-o] 'you wash' (ordinary); but [uḍo] 'get up'.

(b) *Epenthesis*: All the inflexions except those of the Present Indefinite began with an [i] which has been lost but which helped to bring in Vowel Harmony in the root vowel, e.g., [kori, koillam, korium, koirum, koittam].

THE TENSES

Strictly speaking there are six tenses:

(a) Simple Tenses (*Radical Tense*).

(1) *Present Indefinite*:

1st Person: [-i, -ier-]

2nd Person: *Ordinary*, [-ə-ər-]; *Inferior*, [-ts-]; *Honorific* [-ən-].

N.B. The third person honorific is not popular, and native [fieten kore] = Standard তিনি করেন 'he does' instead of [fieten koren] is the usual idiom. The forms with [r] are noteworthy. *

(2) *Past* [-(i)l-] < -il- > of Standard Bengali.

1st Person: [-lam].

2nd Person: *Ordinary*, [-la], *Inferior*, [-li], *Honorific*, [-len].

3rd Person: [-l], [-lò] (not popular).

(3) *Past Habitual and Past Conditional*: [-(i)t] < [-it] (Standard Bengali):

1st Person: [-tam].

2nd Person: [-ta, -ti, -tèn].

3rd Person: [-tò].

(4) *Future*: [-(i)b-] < [-ib-]; with negatives, [-to] < [-it-].

1st Person: [-mu (~u), -um, -iðum]; with negatives, [-tam] (followed by [no] 'not').

2nd Person: [-ba; -bi; -bèn]; with negatives, [-ta; -ti; -tèn].

3rd Person: [-bò]; with negatives, [-to].

(b) *Compound Tenses.*

(i) *Perfect*:

(5) *Present Perfect*: [-is-] = [-iach-] of Standard Bengali.

1st Person: [-si].

2nd Person: [-sò, -sòts; -sèn].

3rd Person: [-se].

* The affix [-r-] is remarkable. In this dialect it is found only in the first and third person Present Indefinite, with a progressive sense; [ram dzaer] রাম যায়ের, [hete khaer] হেতে খায়ের, [āi dzaier] আই যায়ের, [ai korier] আই করিয়ের, etc. The extended forms with the affix to form conjunctives, e.g., Chittagong [diare] দিয়ারে 'on having done', [koriaer] করিয়ারে 'on having given,' etc., or the forms with the present (radical) or past conditional to indicate continuous or progressive action, e.g. E. Sylhet [dzaiar] [dzaitram] [dzairam] 'I go', 'I am going', etc., are unknown to the dialect (see ODBL. § 726). This [-r-], according to ODBL. § 727 "is the contracted form of √kar, and the affix is simply the verbal auxiliary added on to the root". In the Noakhali dialect, [dzaer] যায়ের 'he goes' or 'he is going' has the force of Dacca [dzae ar ki] যায় আর কি, Noakhali [dzae ari] যায় আরি '(yes) he is going.' So the suggestion of Prof. S. K. Chatterji (basing on Grierson's explanation of Khaskurā [-r-] as meaning 'and' = *apara*) that this [-r-] might as well be *āra*, *āara*, *avara*, *apara*, seems to be more plausible. [dzae ari], [khae ari], etc., are very common in the Noakhali dialect.

- (6) *Past Perfect*: [- (i)sil] = « -yāi-a-chil- » (Standard Bengali).
 1st Person: [-silam].
 2nd Person: [-sila; -sili; -silen].
 3rd Person: [-sil]; [-silò] (not popular).

N.B. [-s-] which is a reduction from « √āch » is turned into [-cɟ-] when it comes in contact with the final [-r] of a verbal root: the [-r] is assimilated: e.g., [kòicci < koirsi]. See *ante*.

(ii) *Progressive Tenses.*

The Present Progressive and Past Progressive are two more compound tenses, but in the dialect of Noakhali this shade of meaning is loosely expressed by the simple present or present indefinite, and only when confusion is sought to be avoided, or when the speakers of the patois affect careful speech, the progressive tenses are met with. Again, the tense is not yet a 'compound' form—the two parts of the verb are as yet distinct. Thus, Standard Bengali [kòriteɟhi] করিতেছি = ক'রছি, ক'চ্ছি, ক'চ্ছি [korɟhi, koceɟ(h)i] in the Standard Colloquial, 'I am doing', is represented by [koitto-asi] and not (as could reasonably be expected) by [koittasi].

(7) *Present Progressive*: [- (i)te-as-] = « ite-ch- » of Standard Bengali.

- 1st Person: [-tò-asi].
 2nd Person: [-tò-asò; -tò-asòts; -tò-asen].
 3rd Person: [-tò-ase].

(8) *Past Progressive*: [-itò-asil-] = « ite-chil » of Standard Bengali.

- 1st Person: [-tò-asilam].
 2nd Person: [-tò-asila; -tò-asili, -tò-asilen].
 3rd Person: [-tò-asil(ò)].

It is evident that the two tenses are nothing but the verbs in the present participle affix [-tò-<-it-] with the present and past conjugations of the « √ās » = Standard Bengali « √āch », added to it.

N.B. The Future Progressive and Future Perfect tenses are absent in the dialect, and educated speakers would affect to express the shades of meaning with [-tò], adding in the case [thaikbò], the future of « √āch », to it.

(9) *Imperative 'Tense'* :

In Bengali strictly speaking there is no mood (see ODBL. § 643). The imperative is only a tense—one form is used for the present and another for the future (imperative precativ). None of the forms are complete.

Present Imperative : found in 2nd Person alone ;

Ordinary, familiar : [-ə], e.g., [kərə] কর 'do it'.

Familiar, inferior : simple root : e.g., [kər] কর 'do it'.

Honorific : [-ən, -n], e.g., [dzən] যান, [kəən] করেন 'you go please', 'you do please'.

(10) *Precative Imperative* : found in 2nd and 3rd Persons.

2nd Person : *Ordinary, familiar* : [-iə].

3rd Person : [-uk].

The verbal form [gəi] added to the imperative expresses the imperative in the immediate future, with a slight precativ sense. [gəi] = Standard Bengali [gia] গিয়া 'having gone'.

The Optative Mood is expressed with [dzien] and [dzəməne < dzəmon-i], and sometimes with the conjunctive in [-le] : e.g., [āi dzien (dzəməne) rai] আমি যেন (যেমনে) পাই, 'so that I may get it ;' [dzien kōille āi batsi] যেমন (=যাহা) করিলে আমি বাঁচি 'by that action by which I may be saved'.

The Subjunctive Mood is formed with the help of [dzədi], =Sanskrit < yadi >, in the conditional clause, and [təḍ, təve] in the dependent one : e.g., [dzədi tūi kəḍ. āi dzaium] যদি তুমি কও আমি যাই যাইয়ুম = যদি তুমি কও, আমি যাইব 'If you ask me I shall go'.

N.B. As in all Bengali dialects, the tenses in practice do not signify the sequence of time so rigidly. For the use of the present for past or future, and of the past for the future or present, see *poste*, under 'Syntax'.

THE PARTICIPLES

1. *Present Participle* :

- (a) [-əntə] is rare and, strictly, not native : [dzələntə tsula] জ্বলন্ত চুলা 'burning oven'.

- (b) [-t, -to, -te] : [āi kharat fiinlam] আই খারাত হইনলাম = আমি দাঁড়ানো (অবস্থায়) শুনিলাম 'I heard it standing'; [āi dzaito-e fiste ail] আই বাইত-এ হেতে আইল = আমি বাইতেই সে আসিল 'on my going he came'; [amnera thaikto ni anggo ei sidzzot?] আমনের থাইকত নি আঙ্গো এই সিজ্জৎ? = আপনার থাকিতে নাকি আমাদের এই বিপদ 'are we to have this trouble even while you are present?'

N.B. [-t] also gives verbal nouns, which in the locative, *i.e.*, [-te] as forms the Infinitive. Sometimes the Present Participle forms take personal affixes, *e.g.*, [āi khaitam laiglam] আই খাইতাম লাইগ্লাম = আমি খাইতে লাগিলাম 'I began to eat'. So, also = [fiste khaito laiglo] হেতে খাইত লাইগ্লাম 'he began to eat'; [tūi khaita laigla] তুই খাইতা লাইগ্লাম 'you began to eat'.

2. Past Participle :

[-a] : mostly adjectival: *e.g.*, [fiuna kota] ফুনা কথা = শোনা কথা 'a story heard', [āi d'ora hōri] আই ধরা পড়ি = আমি ধরা পড়ি 'I am caught'; [fisten foa (foat)] হেতেন শোয়া (বা শোয়াৎ) = তিনি শোয়া বা শায়িত, 'he is lying down'; [koi thaikto] কই থাইকত = কহিয়া থাকিবে 'should have said' (see ODBL. § 734).

3. Conjunctions :

- (a) [-i], *e.g.*, [āi ai deiklam] আই আই দেইকলাম = আমি আসিয়া দেখিলাম 'on coming I saw'. It indicates a succession of actions with regard to the same subject.
- (b) [-(i)le] : this is conditional: [aile dzaium] আইলে বাইয়ুম 'when he comes, I shall go'.

4. Verbal Nouns :

- (a) [-on] : the most popular form : [koron] করণ 'the act of doing', [natson] নাচন, [khaon] খাওন 'the act of dancing, eating', etc.
- (b) [-t], with the locative in [o] or [-te] : [fiste 'aitto fare] হেতে হাইটত পারে = সে হাঁটিতে পারে 'he can walk'; ['aitto] 'the act of walking'.
- (c) [-a], in some typical forms : found in the Standard Bengali as well: *e.g.*, [ki mara maicō] কি মারা মাইরছে = কি মারা মারিরাছে 'what a beating he had (or gave)!' ; [fora

boice[je] = পড়া পড়িয়াছে 'read his reading (=lesson)';
 [dzaoa gese] = যাওয়া গেছে 'the act of going has been done';
 [kərar 'oile koitto] = করার হইলে করিত 'if it could be done,
 he would have done it'; etc.

THE CAUSATIVE

1. Causatives are formed with the affix [-a-] < «āya-», and to that are added the personal terminations and participial affixes, e.g., [kər] 'do', [kəra-] 'make one do', [kəraise] করাইয়াছে 'has made some one do'; [kəraite] করাইতে 'to make (making) one do', [kəraile] করাইলে 'on making some one do', etc.

2. In the case of verbs ending in vowels, the causative affix is [-va] < «-wā-» e.g. [khavaə] খাবায়=খাওয়ায় 'makes one eat'; [dɔvaə] দেখায়=দেখায় 'makes one see', etc.

N.B. Causatives turn intransitive verbs into transitive, otherwise there is no difference between the transitive and intransitive declension even in the 3rd Person Singular past tense, in which form the Standard Colloquial has separate affixes.

PARADIGM OF A REGULAR VERB

✓[tsol] চল 'to go.'

1. *Present Indefinite*: tsoli, tsolier; tsolo, tsolots, tsolen; tsole, tsolier, tsolen.
2. *Past*: tsoillam; tsoilla, tsoilli, tsoillen; tsoillo.
3. *Habitual*: tsolitam; tsolita, tsoliti, tsoliten; tsolito.
4. *Future*: tsolum, tsolium, (tsolitam nō); tsoliba, tsolibi, tsoliben (tsolita nō, tsoliti nō); tsolibo (tsolito nō).
5. *Present Perfect*: tsolsi; tsolso, tsolsots, tsolsen; tsolse.
6. *Past Perfect*: tsolsilam; tsolsila, tsolsilen, tsolsili; tsolsil, tsolsilo.
7. *Present Progressive*: tsolte-asi; tsolto-aso, tsolto-asots, tsolto-asen; tsolto-ase.
8. *Past Progressive*: tsolto-asilam; tsolto-asila, tsolto-asili, tsolto-asilen; tsolto-asil(o).
9. *Imperative*: tsolo, tsol, tsolen.

10. *Precativ*: tsolio, tsoluk.

11. *Participles*: tsolonto, tsailto; tsola.

Conjunctives: tsoli; tsaille.

Verbal Nouns: tsolon, tsola.

Causative: tsalai; tsalao, tsalats; with change of root vowel form [tsol] to [tsal], inherited from Prakrit and Sanskrit.

THE PASSIVE VOICE

The living method of forming the passive is inflectional.

(i) [-on] (affix of the verbal noun) plus the root $\sqrt{[ʔ]} = [ʃa]$ 'to be', or $\sqrt{[dza]}$ 'to go', with the direct object (neuter) without affix, and indirect or sole object in the dative (the subject is generally understood). Thus, e.g., [ʃistere ei kəta koon gel] হেতেরে এই কথা কওন গেল = তাহাকে এই কথা বলা হইল 'he was told this'.

(ii) [-a], the passive participle or verbal noun (see ODBL. §662) + the root $\sqrt{[ʔ]}$ or $\sqrt{[dza]}$, the object being put in the dative. Thus, e.g., [āre dsa (dɛva) dzaɛ] আরে দেবা (দেবা) যায় = আমাকে দেখা যায় 'I am seen'.

N.B. Both these are impersonal constructions.

(iii) The construction with [-a] (passive participle) + $\sqrt{[hər < fər < pər]}$, 'to fall', and the object in the nominative: e.g. [āi dʔra hoillam] আই ধরা হইলাম = আমি ধরা পড়িলাম 'I was caught'. This is idiomatic, and is in the nature of Compound Verbs (see *post*).

THE DENOMINATIVES

Denominatives are not a characteristic feature of this dialect. Thus, many of the denominative finite verbs of the Standard Bengali are unknown in the patois, e.g., Standard Bengali [ʃhɛɳiɛʃe] ঠেঙিয়েছে, is represented in the dialect by [ʃhɛŋga di maicɛʃe] ঠেঙ্গা দি মাইকে 'has beaten with a stick.' So also with regard to [ʃhutiɛʃe] জুতিয়েছে 'has beaten with shoes'; [gɦuʃiɛʃe] গুঘিয়েছে 'has dealt a blow with the fist', etc.

The device for forming denominatives is similar to that of the Standard Bengali—epenthesis of [i] appears, however, in the root vowels, as affixes are added.

(1) The noun is turned into the verb (not a common process) :
e.g., [kʰɔɪ̯] হাঁহ = যুক্ত করিয়াছে, 'has yoked' or 'harnessed';
[ʈaɪ̯kʰɔɪ̯] মইক্ছে = পাকিয়াছে, 'is ripe'; [kʰɔimse] কইম্ছে = কমিয়াছে 'has become less.'

(2) Addition of the affix [a] to the noun : [gʱumailo] ঘুমাইল 'slept'; [ʈaɪ̯kʰɔɪ̯] বেতাইল = বেত দিয়া মারিল 'flogged'; [gʱɔɪ̯kʰɔɪ̯] গিডাইছে = গাঁট বাঁধিয়াছে 'tied a knot'; etc.

VERB SUBSTANTIVE

Properly speaking there are only three substantive verbs :

(1) [as] (= √*ach) 'to be' is found only in the following :

Present tense : 1st Person : [asi]; 2nd [asə, asəts, asen];
3rd Person : [ase], [asen] (rare).

Past tense : 1st Person : [asilam]; 2nd Person : [asila, asili, asilen]; 3rd Person : [asil], [asilo] (rare).

N.B. No aphæresis of the initial [a-] occurs, unlike Standard Bengali ছিলাম, ছিলে, etc.

(2) √[ʈə] (= √ha, √ho) 'to become'. (See ODBL., §767.) It has preserved the inflexions fully.

(3) √[tha] (= √*thāk) 'to remain', 'to stay', is found in the present, future and past.

Present tense : [thai; thaə, thaəts, thaen; thaɔ̯, thaə].

Future tense : [thaum; thaikba, thaikbi, thaikben; thaikbo].

Imperative : 2nd Person : [thaə, thaen].

Precative : 2nd Person : [thaio]; 3rd Person : [thauk].

(4) √[rə] (= √rah) is found only in the past along with, √[tha]; thus—

[roilam thaiklam; roila, roili, roilen + thaikla, thaikli, thaiklen; roilo thaiklo].

In the present and past, [roi, roium] etc., are found, but they are rare.

IRREGULAR VERBS

On account of the different phonetic development, many verbs in this dialect when compared with their equivalents in the Standard Bengali would appear irregular. But in fact they are not so. Some of the real irregularities are indicated below :—

- (1) [de] দে 'to give'. The dialect has the root-vowel changed practically into [di] in all places except—

Present tense : 2nd Person : *Ordinary* [dɔ], [*Honorific*] [dɛn] ;
3rd Person : [dɛɔ].

Imperative : 2nd *Ordinary* [dɔ, dɛɔ], *Inferior* [de], *Honorific* [dɛn].

Participles and Verbal Nouns : [dɛn, dɛɔa].

- (2). [dʒa] যা 'to go'. The verb is replaced by [ge-] in the following forms :

Past : [gelam ; gela, geli ; gel (gelo)].

Present Perfect : [gesi ; gesɔ, gesɔts, gesɛn], etc.

Past Perfect : [gesilam, gesila, gesili, gesilɛ], etc.

Verbal Conjunctive : [gi], *Conditional* : [gele].

[ge-] by some speakers is turned into [gɛ-] : ordinarily it is preserved as [ge-].

- (3) [lɔ] নে 'to carry,' 'to take'. The root vowel is often slightly raised towards [lo], but in some cases it is distinctly broad, e.g., *Present* : 2nd Person : [ləs] ;
Imperative : [lɔ].

- (4) [a] 'to come' which is affiliated to [aɔ < aɪ < aʃ].

Present : [ai ; aiɔ, aɛ, aien ; aie].

Present Perfect : [aisi ; aiɔ, aisɔts, aisɛn ; aise].

Past Perfect : [aisilam ; aisila, aisili], etc.

Progressive Present : [aito-asi ; aito-aɔ], etc.

Progressive Past : [aito-asilam ; aito-asila], etc.

Past : [ailam ; aila, aili], etc.

Future : [aium ; aiba, aibi], etc.

Imperative : [aio, aien].

Precative : [aið, aiuk], etc.

Participles : [aon, ai, aile, aʃa (puristic), aɔa (by analogy)].

DUPLICATED VERBS

Duplicated verbs to express repeated, intensive or continuous action, are also found (see ODBL, § 776).

- (1) With conjunctives in [-i] or present participle in [-tə]: *e.g.* [g'uri g'uri dzað] ঘুরি ঘুরি যায়=ঘুরিয়া ঘুরিয়া যায় 'goes there again and again'; [khaitə khaitə kəilo] খাইত খাইত কইল=খাইতে খাইতে বলিল, 'said while eating'.
- (2) Onomatopoeitic verbs, the second number of the verb echoing the first in sound and strengthening the idea contained in the first: *e.g.*, [kaⁿ di-ka^{di}] কান্দিকাদি=কাঁদিয়া কাটিয়া 'crying'; [baki-saki] বকিছকি=বকিয়া ঝকিয়া 'rebuking'; [larai-falai] লাফাই ফালাই=লাফাইয়া-ঝাফাইয়া 'jumping, making a scene or a row'.
- (3) Verbals nouns of reciprocity: *e.g.*, [dzana-dzani] জানাজানি 'making known among people'; [mara-mari] মারামারি 'skirmish'; [dēa-dēi] দেয়া-দেই=দেওয়া-নেওয়া 'giving and receiving'.

COMPOUND VERBS

It is one of the most important classes of the verb, and the dialect has in abundance such verbs in which the root following (in the nature of an auxiliary) takes the affixes, strengthening or modifying the principal part, which is a noun or verbal conjunctive or participle. (See ODBL, § 777.)

Types of such Compound Verbs are: (1) *Nominals*:

- (a) In which the noun is in the accusative: [rag-kora] রাগ করা 'to be angry'; [sar kora] সাফ করা 'to cleanse'; [tṣa mare] টেয়া মারে=টাকা মারে 'misappropriates money', etc.
- (b) Locative—only a few are found; *e.g.*, [kan dsoa] কান দেওয়া 'to give ear'.
- (c) With verbal nouns in [-tə]. the verb √* lāg > 'to begin' (<lāg, 'to be attached to') in an inceptive sense; √[tṣa] 'to want', in the desiderative; √[fara] 'to be able' in the

potential; $\sqrt{[raoa]}$ 'to get' in the accusative, and $\sqrt{[de]}$ 'to give' in the permissive. Thus:

[khaito laigze] খাইত লাইগ্জে = খাইতে আরম্ভ করিয়াছে 'has begun to eat'.

[khaito tsað] খাইত চায় = খাইতে চাহে 'wants to eat'.

[khaito fare] খাইত ফারে = খাইতে পারে 'may eat' or 'has the capacity for eating'.

[khaito fað] খাইত ফায় = খাইতে পায় 'obtains food to eat'.

[khaito dsə] খাইত দেয় = খাইতে দেয় 'allows him to eat', or 'gives food'.

(2) *Verbals*:

The preceding verb with the conjunctive in [-i], the succeeding verbs commonly being [uða] (< $\sqrt{u\theta\bar{h}a}$ >) 'to rise', [fora] (< $\sqrt{par\bar{a}}$ >) 'to fall', [dɛa] 'to give', [nɛa] 'to take', [dzaðə] 'to go', [laɣa] 'to begin', [fala] (< $\sqrt{phel\bar{a}}$ >) 'to throw down', [boðə] (< $\sqrt{bas\bar{a}}$ >) 'to sit', etc. Examples:

[ragi uðe] রাগি উড়ে = রাগিয়া উঠে 'gets angry' (inceptive).

[di dsə] দি দেয় = দিয়া দেয় 'give away' (intensive).

[koi fala] কই ফালা = বলিয়া ফেল 'speak out' (completive).

[kəri dzað] করি যায় 'goes on doing' (continuative).

[folai dzað] ফলাই যায় 'flies away' (intensive).

[d'ori boilə] ধরি বইল 'caught, caught and retained hold' (statical).

AFFIXES

Besides the plural, the enclitic and the participial affixes referred to above, there are a large number of other affixes, both nominal and verbal: some of these are set forth below.

Nominal:

- (1) [-a]: definitive, connective, pleonastic, etc. [rama] রামা in contemptuously speaking of person named Rām; [utsa-nitsa] উচা-নীচা = উচু-নীচু 'up and down'; [bora] বরা = বড় 'big', [ʔanda] আন্ধা 'blind'; [tsora] চোরা 'thief', [b'ala] ভালা = ভালো 'good', [kala] কালা = কালো 'dark,' etc.

- (2) [-ami], forming abstract nouns indicative of a characteristic: *e.g.*, [tʰedami] তেঁডামি 'perversity', [bandrami] বান্দরামি 'trickishness', [baislami] বাইছলামি = বাচালতা 'levity, talkativeness', etc.
- (3) [-al]: 'pertaining to' or 'possessing' (< *-āla- affix), *e.g.*, [bangal] বাঙ্গাল 'ignorant man', [baitsal] বাইচাল 'frivolous'; [pātsal] পেঁচাল (কথা) (< পাঁচালি, পঞ্চালিকা pāñcali, pañcalikā) 'a talk'.
- [-al] (< pāla) denotes connection or profession: *e.g.*, [paittal] পাইটাল = পাটীয়াল 'those who make mats'; [goal] গোয়াল 'milkman', [maidāl] মাইডাল 'those who dig earth for excavation work'. The cognate Hindostani form < wālā > < ālā > < āl > is very popular in this dialect and has merged into this [-al], *e.g.*, [bariala] বাড়িয়াল 'landlord', [gariala] গাড়িয়াল 'cart-man', [ṛṣṛāla] ফেড়াল = ভুঁড়িওয়াল 'one with a large paunch', [sata-ala] ছাতাওয়াল 'one with an umbrella.'
- (4) [-ani] from the verbal noun in [-an-]: *e.g.*, [ṣunani] শুনানি 'hearing of a lawsuit'; [tsalani] চালানি (মাল) 'goods to be transported'; [dzalani] জালানি (কাঠ) 'faggots for fire'.
- (5) [-oinna] < *-aniā (< -an- + -iyā) >: a common agentive affix: *e.g.*, [dzaoinna] ড়াঅইনা 'one who is to go'; [kəroinna] করইনা 'one who is to do', [dekhainna] দেখাইনা 'one who is to show', etc. (see no. 8).

It is adjectival in character when formed from the passive participle [-an]: *e.g.*, [banainna] বানাইনা 'one that has been manufactured'. Being secondary in nature these are not classed among verbal affixes.

- (6) [-ar] as in Standard Bengali, forming agent nouns: [kamar] কামার 'smith'; [kuār < kumhār] কুয়ার = কুম্হার 'potter,' etc.
- (7) [-i]:
- (a) to express the place of origin (< -Iya): *e.g.*, [deṣi] দেশী 'native', [bilati] বিলাতী 'foreign'; [ḍ'akai] ঢাকাই 'of Dacca', etc. This affix may be extended by [-a]: *e.g.*, [ḍ'akaia] ঢাকাইয়া, [tsaḡḡāia] চাট্টিগাঁইয়া, [ramgoinḍza] রামগাইয়া, etc.

- (b) to express possession [i] (< -i < -in): *e.g.*, [b'ari] ভারি 'heavy', [dami] দামি 'costly', [golapi] গোলাপী 'rose-coloured', etc.
- (c) to express any characteristic or profession: [-i] (< -ikā : also < Persian -i): *e.g.*, [rɔnditi] পণ্ডিতী, [maʃtori] মাস্তরি 'the profession of a *pundit* or master' or 'the airs of a *pundit* (pedantry) or of an English teacher'; [okaloti] ওকালতী 'practice of the law', [ʃtani] সতানী = সমতানি 'mischievousness, viciousness (like Satan), [dzuattsuri] জুয়াচুরি = জুয়াচুরি 'charlatanism'; [soʃolo (k)i] ছোটলোই = ছোটলোকি 'ways like that of the rustic or the vulgar'; [bɔrmajfi] বড় মাইনবি 'the airs of a big man'; etc.
- (d) in the sense 'connected with' or 'belonging to': *e.g.*, [ʃɔrkari] সরকারী 'connected with the Government'; [ʃɔttani] পত্তনি 'connected with or belonging to the *pattani* system of land tenure'.
- (e) a feminine affix (-i < -ikā): *e.g.*, [tsatsi] চাচী 'aunt', [mami] মামী 'maternal uncle's wife', [ʃagli] পাগলী 'mad woman'. With original objects in feminine, of which the gender is no matter now: *e.g.*, [meʃi] মেডা = মাটি 'earth', [ruti] পুঁথি 'book', [laʃi] লাড়ি = লাঠি 'stick', [kaʃi] কাড়ি = কাঠি 'a stick, or thin round piece of bamboo or wood', etc.
- (8) [-ia] = the Standard Bengali «-iyā». It is used in the sense of 'pertaining to', in slight disparagement; and it is also used pleonastically (see *ante*, 7a): *e.g.*, [uttaira] উত্তাইরা = উত্তরিয়া 'pertaining to the north'; [aulla] আউল্লা = আউলা এলো 'dishevelled'; [dzoulla] জউল্লা = জলুয়া 'watery'; [bainna] বাইন্লা = বানিয়া বেনে 'merchant'; [deoinna] দেওইন্লা = দেবনিয়া = 'giver'; etc. (See *ante*, 5.)

N.B. [-i] introduces epenthesis, and the consequent phonetic modification characteristic of the dialect, *e.g.*, doubling of the final consonant and adding to that the affix [-a]. In the Standard Colloquial Bengali, phonetic changes go further, and as a result the affix appears as [-e]: *e.g.*, [utturre] উত্তুরে 'northern'.

- (9) [-ua]: to indicate connection or relation: adjectival in character (see ODBL., § 429): *e.g.* [baua] বাউয়া

'left-handed', [g'aua] বাউরা = বেরো 'one with sores'; [g'oura] বউরা = বরুয়া, বরো 'pertaining to the house', hence, 'home-keeping' or 'homely'; [doura] ডউরা (< ডর + darṣ-) 'timid'; [gautssa] গাউছা = গেছো 'one who is quite happy on a tree' (like a monkey); [mautssa] মাউছা = মেছো 'connected with fish'.

With proper names ending originally in [-u], to indicate familiarity and contempt: *e.g.*, [m'oudda] মউদা (< মধু) 'Madhu'. Similarly, [dzoudda], [kaulla], [faudda] বউদা, কাউলা, সাউদা, etc. For epenthesis and the modification, compare the foregoing changes in the case of the Affix (8).

- (10) [-ko]: pleonastic and adjectival. It is not typical in this dialect. It is found also in the extended form as [-ki]: *e.g.*, [kutski] কুচ্কি 'thigh', [boiṭhoki] বৈঠকি 'pertaining to a social gathering', etc.
- (11) [-ṭ, -ṭa, -ṭi], which form some important words to express resemblance, connection or modification of a trade or habit, are not peculiar to the Noakhali dialect alone; *e.g.*, [darot] দাপট 'power, strong hand or heavy hand'; [lentṭa, lentṭi] লেংটা, লেংটি 'naked', 'loin cloth'; [tseptṭa] চেপ্টা 'flat'; [tsimoiṭ] চিমইট = চিমটি 'pinching'; etc.
- (12) [-ra, -ri] = Standard Bengali -rā, -rī, form an important group, but are not typical of the Noakhali dialect alone, *e.g.*, [khar] খোয়ার 'pound' to keep stray cattle; [dzoar] জোয়ার 'the flood tide'; [ṭukra, ṭukri] টুকরা, টুকরি 'a piece (of wood or paper)', 'a basket'.
- (13) [-na] (< -ān-, the verbal noun, extended with -ā-).
- (a) It indicates a coarser action or biggish aspect of the action. Much of this original force is however lost in the formations. [baṭna] বাটনা 'curry paste', [kuṭna] কুটনা 'cut-up (*i.e.*, made ready) vegetables', [dena rana] দেনা পানা = দেনা পাওনা 'debit and credit', [ṭukna] হুকনা = শুকনা 'dried up'.
- (b) Some of the nouns in [-na] are directly from nouns: *e.g.*, [rakna] ফাকনা (< পাখ) 'wings', [boukna] বৌকনা 'a kind of brass pot'.

- (c) [-ni], the feminine form of [-na], often expresses the pretty aspect of the action or the object: *e.g.*, [seni] <chedanikā> ছেনি 'a chisel'; [akni] ঢাকনি 'lid'; [sani] ছানি, ছাউনি 'cover'; etc.
- (d) [-ni] is of course the all-Bengal feminine affix: [tsunni] চুন্নি = চোরণী 'a woman thief'; [maʃtɔnni] মাষ্টাৰণী = মাষ্টারনী 'a woman teacher'. The final [-i] is dropped, as in [natin] নাতিন 'grand-daughter', [hotin] সতীন 'co-wife', etc., normally. In the case of [-ni], we have a strengthening with [i] = (e) above.
- (14) [-fana>-ana]: 'like', 'resembling' = English affix '-ish': *e.g.*, [kala-ana] কালোআনা = কালোপান 'blackish'.
- (15) [-la, -la] denote resemblance or possession, or are simply pleonastic: *e.g.*, [fatol, ratla] পাতলা, পাংলা 'light, thin'; [agila] আগিলা = আগেকার 'the future one' or 'formerly'; [kamla] কামলা 'worker, labourer'; etc.
- (16) [-ʃi, -fa] are not typical of the dialect: *e.g.*, [roʃa] ফর্সা 'clear, as of the sky'; [dʒəʃ] ডেঁড়স 'a kind of vegetable, "lady's finger"'.
- (17) [-ʃor, -fra], in a few special words: *e.g.*, [ʃorʃor] এঁ অশ্বর = একেধর 'alone', [doʃra] দোসরা 'the second one'.

FOREIGN SUFFIXES

- (18) [-an, -oan], in the sense of 'possessing': *e.g.*, [garoan] গাড়োয়ান 'coachman', [daroan] দারোয়ান = দরোয়ান 'gatekeeper'.
- (19) [-ani] meaning 'having the nature of': *e.g.*, [bauani] বাউআনি 'the ways of a Babu', [ʃinduani] ইন্দুয়ানি = হিন্দুয়ানি 'the ways of a Hindu'.
- (20) [-k(h)ana] meaning 'abode': [boiðakkana] বৈডকানা = বৈঠকখানা 'the sitting room'. Also occurs as [-ana]: [daktorana] ডাক্তার আনা = ডাক্তারখানা 'dispensary'.
- (21) [-gor] 'maker': [karigor>karior] কারিঅর = কারিগর 'a mechanic'.
- (22) [-giri] meaning trade or style: [baugiri] বাউগিরি = বাবুগিরি 'the airs of a Babu'; [daroggiri] দারোগগিরি = দারোগাগিরি 'the work of a Darogha or police sub-inspector'.

- (23) [-təɔ] : meaning 'like'. Only instance is [betəɔ] বেতর 'intractable'.

Most of the above are found in the Standard Bengali. So also are (24) [-dani] 'receptacle', (25) [-dar] 'holder', (26) [-nəbɪʃ] 'writer', etc.

VERBAL AFFIXES

[-ə], an affix, is lost because of the phonetic laws in Bengali: e.g., [tsol ase] চল আছে 'it is current'.

- (1) [-ən] is the most useful affix to form abstract verbal nouns, and can be added to almost any verb for the purpose. [kʊən], [khaən], [gaən] কণন, খাণন, গাণন, etc., 'speaking', 'eating', 'singing', etc. Some of these have acquired concrete sense as much as in the Standard Bengali: e.g., [dzʊlən] জুলন 'Jhulan festival'; [mərən] মরণ 'death'. For extension to [-na], see *ante* Formative Affix No. 13.

In this dialect [-ən] is also a passive participle affix, as in the following instances: [kərən ʔaise] করণ 'অইছে = করা হইয়াছে' 'it has been done'; [fietener dʒaən ʔaibə] হেতেনের যাণন 'অইব = তাঁর যাণন হইবে' 'his going is settled, or will take place'; [aŋgo ɡit funən ʔaɪl na] আঙ্গ গীত ফুন 'অইল না = আমাদের গান শোনা হইল না' 'our listening to the music did not come about'.

- (2) [-əntə], has few examples, and they are not typical: [tsələntə] চলন্ত 'running', [dʒələntə] জলন্ত 'burning', etc.

[-ət], a cognate affix, found only in [rərət] ফেরৎ 'returning, return'; [rərət] পারত as in [rərət p'oikke] পারতপক্ষে 'if one can accomplish it'.

- (3) [-a], in the passive participle, and in verbal nouns, has already been described (see *ante*).
- (4) [-an] forms verbal nouns from causative and demonstrative verbs (see before), and passive participles of the same classes: [kərən gese] করান গেছে '(it) has been accomplished'; [dean dʒaɔ] দেআন যায় = দেওয়া যায় '(it) can be given'; etc.

- (5) [-i] : this verbal noun affix was elided, but left its mark in certain epenthetic forms: *e.g.*, [mair] মাইর<মারি=মারা 'beating', [fair] সাইর<সারি=সার, 'row'; [gail] গাইল<গালি=গাল 'abuse'; etc.

[-i] exists in certain forms in the second member of a verb repeated (the first member being in [-a], the verbal noun affix), to express reciprocity or repetition of the action: *e.g.*, [mara-mari] মারামারি 'mutual fight, in which both parties give and take blows'; [boka-baki] বকাবকি 'abusing or scolding each other'; [fala-fali] ফালাফালি=লাফালাপি 'jumping and skipping'; [daka-daki] ডাকাডাকি 'calling again and again'.

- (6). [-òia] : an agentive affix, exactly similar to the Nominal affix [-oinna] (see *ante*, Nominal Affix No. 5), is rather puristic in the dialect: *e.g.*, [khaoia] খাওইয়া 'eater'; [foraia] ফরাইয়া=পড়ুয়া 'reader'; etc.

COMPOUNDS

Bengali dialects form compounds spontaneously. Such compounds are numerous, and are made when required. Adopting the orthodox classification of Indian grammarians, we may group up the typical Bengali compounds as follows, excluding compoundings with unchanged Sanskrit words made in accordance with the rules of Sanskrit grammar.

I. TATPURUṢA

Compounds with Nouns

The former of the two members has the modifying force, but the latter generally expresses the important element. *Tatpuruṣas* of different relationships are :

- (1) [d'an-khet] দানক্ষেত 'paddy-field'; [flour-ba(r)i] হউরবাই=হউর বাড়ী=শুগুর বাড়ি 'father-in-law's house'; [mudi-doan] মুদি-দোআন=মুদীর দোকান 'a grocer's shop'; [rel-ga(r)i] রেল-গাই=রেল-গাড়ী, 'railway train'; etc. These express the

genitive relation between the first member and the second.

- (2) [foka-d'ora] ফোকা-ধরা = পোকা-ধরা 'worm-eaten', [da-kaḍa] দা-কাড়া = দা-কাটা 'cut by a *dāo*', etc., express the instrumentality of the first.
- (3) [gas-raka] গাছ-পাকা 'ripe on the tree', [badzar-tola] বাজার-তোলা 'gathered in the market', express the locative relation.
- (4) [bari-sara] বাড়ি-ছাড়া 'away from home', [def-sara] দেশ-ছাড়া 'away from the country', etc., express the ablative relation.

II. UPAPADA

Though properly it forms a different group, yet the *Upapada* in this dialect often overlaps the *Tatpuruṣa*. Nouns compounded with secondary nouns, *i. e.*, verbs turned into nouns with affixes form the *Upapadas*. Here, the examples in last three classes of Group I, *Tatpuruṣa* (2), (3) and (4), belong to this *Upapada* group as well. Further instances are—[g'or-pora] গর-পোড়া 'burning of the house'; [kolai-kora] কলাই-করা 'enamelled'; [tsorka-kata] চরকা-কাটা 'spun with the spinning wheel'; [b'at-mora] ভাত-মরা 'starved of food'; etc.

III. KARMADHĀRAYA

In which Adjectives *plus* Nouns become Nouns; *e.g.*, [bər-bau] বড় বাড়ি = বড় বাবু 'the Head Assistant'; [m'oa-muḥkil] মহা-মুশ্কিল = মহা মুশ্কিল 'great trouble'; [mulbi-sav] মুলবি-সাব = মৌলভী সাহেব 'the Maulavi'; [ek-din] এক দিন 'one day'; [din-dui] দিন দুই 'about two days'; [dzolpara] জল-পড়া 'water on which some incantation has been uttered (and which has thus been rendered mystically potent to cure diseases)'; etc.

[okommə] অকাম, [akam] আকাম 'work of no consequence'; [begotik] বেগতিক 'no way out'; [ʃo-khanek] শ' খানেক 'about a hundred'; etc. do not follow the strict rules,

One important type of the compounds of this group is very valuable for helping in the economy of words. These are *Madhya-pada-lopī Karmadhārayas*. Two words expressive of the main ideas are compounded together, leaving out the intervening word or words which express the relationship between them: *e.g.*, [mal-g'ari] মাল (বহিবার) গাড়ী 'goods train'; [hani-b'at] হানি-ভাত = পানি (মিশান)-ভাত 'rice mixed with water'; [maia-i'skul] মাইয়া-ইস্কুল = মেয়ে ইস্কুল (মেয়েদের পড়িবার ইস্কুল) 'school for girls to read'; [b'at-mōra] ভাতমরা (ভাতের অভাবে মরা) 'starved for want of food'; etc.

IV. DVANDVA

(Noun + Noun = Noun)

Two nouns both of which retain their meaning are compounded, and only the conjunctive word is dropped: *e.g.*, [bap-ma] বাপ-মা 'father and mother'; [fola-maia] পোলা-মাইয়া = পুত্রকন্যা 'sons and daughters'; [rait-din] রাইত-দিন 'day and night'; [tsun-furki] চুন-সুরকি 'lime and powdered bricks'; etc. [adaṣ-ṣul] আদাষ-অশুল 'receipts'; [dʒəmi-dʒoma] জমি-জমা 'land and revenue'; [khaḍzna-baḍzna] খাḍজনা-বাḍজনা 'rent and beating of drums', *i. e.*, 'rents and other dues',—are some words which are used in pairs as they are connected by a common idea.

V. BAHUVRĪHI

The two elements of a compound express a third object or characteristic: [do-tsala] দোচালা 'thatched house,' [te-mala] তেমালা = তিন-মহলা 'three-storied'; [aṭ-ʔati] আট-আতি = আট-হাতি 'of eight cubits'; [biṣ-godzi] বিশ-গজী 'of twenty yards'; [tsoumuni] চৌমুনী 'the place where four streets meet'; [bilai-tsouka] বিলাই-চৌখা = বিড়াল চক্ষু 'one who has eyes like those of a cat', *i. e.*, 'grey-eyed'; [tsouk-khagi] চৌখ-খাগী 'a woman who has lost her eyes, a careless woman'; [dʒa'z-b'orti] জাহাজ ভরতি 'cargo with which a ship is loaded to the fullest capacity'; [ʔata-ʔati] 'আতা-আতি = হাতাহাতি 'hand to hand fighting'; etc.

VI. AVYAYIBHĀVA

Such compounds are not common: the indeclinable in the compound is prominent. Thus, [ʔoittadzon] পইত্য-জন=প্রত্যেকজন, প্রতিজন 'every one'; [ʔoitta-doan] পইত্য-দোকান=প্রতি দোকান 'every shop'; [gərmil] গরমিল 'want of agreement'; [ʔor-ʔadzir] গর-আজির=গর-হাজির 'not present'; etc.

SYNTAX

The syntax is of the Standard Bengali (Colloquial) type. Simple sentences are naturally preferred, and verbal conjunctives are not admitted to lengthen sentences inordinately by more than one clause. Compound verbs are of course a natural feature.

The ordinary type of a sentence is :

Subject + Object (direct + indirect) + Predicate.

The predicate is not an essential part in all Bengali sentences. The copula is usually dropped: *e.g.*, [ʔolaga b'alo] পোলাগা ভাল' = ছেলেটি ভালো 'the boy is good'. In reply to questions, again, the predicate is commonly left understood: *e.g.*, [ke dzaʔ ʔ-ʔotuk] কে যায় ʔ-পথুক=কে যায় ʔ-পথিক 'who goes there ʔ-A traveller'.

The simple order indicated above is varied.

- (1) The Instrumental comes after the subject: [ʔi fistere di boi ʔadaisi] আই হেতেরে দি বই ফাড়াইছি=আমি তাকে দিয়া বই পাঠাইয়াছি 'I sent the book by him'.
- (2) The ablative is used after the subject: [ʔisten baitton aise] হেতেন বাইতন আইছে=তিনি বাড়ী হইতে আসিয়াছেন 'He has come from home'. But in an interrogation, or when the noun in ablative is specially pointed at as if in reply to a question, it generally precedes the subject: *e.g.*, [baitton ke aise] বাইতন কে আইছে ʔ 'who has come from home ʔ'; [baitton dadaʔ aise] বাইতন দাদা আইছে=বাড়ী হইতে দাদা আসিয়াছেন 'Brother is come from home'.
- (3) Locatives like the ablative come immediately before or after the subject: *e.g.*, [ʔi bait thai] আই বাইৎ থাই=আমি

বাড়িতে থাকি 'I remain at home'; [bait dadað thae] বাইং দাদায় থাকে=বাড়িতে দাদা থাকেন 'Brother lives at home'. In the latter construction special attention is focussed on the locative.

- (4) Verbal conjunctive clauses come after the nominative, preceding or following the object of the finite verb: *e.g.*, [ãi bait gi hstere de'klam], [ãi hstere bait gi de'klam] আই বাইং গি হেতেরে দেইকলাম, আই হেতেরে বাইং গি দেইকলাম (the latter slightly forces attention on the object) 'I saw him on going home'.
- (5) Adverbial phrases are mobile, ordinarily preceding the qualified verb, and may be placed at the head of the sentence: *e.g.*, [ãi hstere loi tora-tori hiane gelam] [ãi tora-tori...], [tora-tori ãi] আই হেতেরে লই তরাতরি হিয়েনে গেলাম, আই হেতেরে লই হিয়েনে তরাতরি গেলাম, আই তরাতরি....., তরাতরি আই.....=আমি তাকে লইয়া তাড়াতাড়ি সেখানে গেলাম, etc. 'I quickly went there with him'.
- (6) When the First and Second Personal pronouns are in the nominative, they are omitted in short replies or assertions—the finite verb expresses the person quite well: [gelam] গেলাম 'I or we went'; or [gela] গেলা 'you went'; etc.
- (i) Adjectives precede the nouns and do not change for gender: *e.g.*, [b'alo mainne] ব'ল' মাইনে=ভাল মানুষ 'good man'.
- (a) But adjectives with nouns are used at times as complement to predicates, and then they come last: *e.g.*, [hste b'alo manof] হেতে ব'ল' মানস=সে ভালো মানুষ 'he is a good man'; [hste manof [b'alo] হেতে মানস ব'ল'=সে মানুষ ভালো 'as a man he is good'.
- (b) Pronouns precede the adjectives qualifying them: [hste dufta] হেতে ছুই=সে ছুই 'he is mischievous'.
- (c) Some adjectives are used as nouns: *e.g.*, [fiada kaor] হাদা কাওর=শাদা কাপড় 'white cloth'; as noun, [fiada-e b'ala] হাদাএ ব'লা=শাদাই ভালো 'the white is quite good'; etc.

- (8) [ar] আর 'and' is the only conjunctive indeclinable, joining two or more nominatives or objects. When sentences are joined with [ar], the word has the meaning of Standard Bengali পরে «pare» 'after' or অমনি «amāni» 'immediately after': *e.g.*, [āi ar dadaṭṭ gesi] আই আর দাদায় গেছি = আমি ও দাদা গিয়াছি 'I and my elder brother went'; [āi gesi ar dada koil] আই গেছি আর দাদা কইল = আমি গেলে পরে দাদা কহিলেন, আমি বাই গিয়াছি অমনি দাদা বলিলেন 'after I went, my brother said', 'as I went, my brother said immediately.'

[dzodi] যদি 'if', [təṭ, toi] তবু, তই = তবে 'then', [tṭə] তঁঅ = তবুও 'still', are some other indeclinables to form complex sentences. The indeclinable [ni] নি, originally a negative, and then an interrogative of uncertainty, implies certainty, in non-interrogative sentences: *e.g.*, [rame ni koil] রামে নি কইল = রাম(-ই) কহিল 'Ram himself said'; but [rame ni koil?] রামে নি কইল? = রাম-ই কি কহিল? 'is it Ram who said?'

- (9) Verbs express the tense, of the action as well as the person of the nominatives. There is no rigid law for sequence of tense in Bengali.
- (a) The Present tense is used for the Past with the correlatives $dzə:n \dots tə:n$ যন-তন = যখন তখন 'when...then', [dzəto...təto] যত...তত 'so much as': *e.g.*, [fiṣte dzə:n dzaṭ, āi tə:n rəte] হেতে যন যায়, আই তন পথে = সে যখন যায় আমি তখন পথে 'when he went, I was on the road'; [āi dzəto koi fiṣte fiṣne na] আই যত কই হেতে হনে না 'much as I said, he would not listen'.
- (b) The Present for the Past in queries: [fiṣte dzaṭ ka] হেতে যায় কা? = সে যায় কেন? 'why did (or does) he go?'
- (c) The Present Tense for the Immediate Future: [ə:ne loi] অনে লই = এখনই বাইতেছি 'shall be going just now'; [kharan, ai:] খারান, আই = দাঁড়ান, আসছি 'please wait, I am coming'.
- (d) Past for the Future, to express immediacy: *e.g.*, [anne doa na koille amra-tə moillam] আমনে দয়া না কইল্লে আমরা ত

মইল্লাম=আপনি দয়া না করিলে আমরা ত মরিব 'if you dont take pity, we shall die'.

- (e) Past for Future to express wish: *e.g.*, [fiste aile to b'alaie oita] হেতে আইলে ত ব'লা-এ 'অইত=সে আইলে তো ভালোই হইত 'it would be very well were he to come'.
- (f) Past for the Present to express deference for the person spoken to, or hesitancy on the part of the speaker: [ailam, fudzur, kisu fɛallai] আইলাম হুজুর কিছু টেক্সালাই=আসিয়াছি, হুজুর, কিছু টাকার জন্ত 'I am come, sir, for some money'.
- (g) The Past Habitual is used to express wish (*cf.* English): *e.g.*, [anne ki koitten ni?] আন্নে কি কইতেন নি? =আপনি কি করিবেন? 'would you not do this?'; [kòittam-e tsai] কইতাম-এ চাই=করিতেই চাই 'I would like to do it'; see under Conjugation, and also below, (12).
- (h) The Present Indefinite is used for the Past Conjunctive Participle in its sense: *e.g.*, [āi gesi rɔre fiste ail] আই গেছি পরে হেতে আইল=আমি গেলে পরে সে আসিল 'he came after I went'; [āi fuisi rɔr(e) fiste fuitlo] আই হুইছি পর হেতে হুইল=আমি শুইলে পরে সে শুইল 'he laid himself down after I went to bed'; etc. The Standard Bengali form, as noted, is quite different.
- (10) Verbs are duplicated to express repetition or reciprocity. (See *ante*, under 'Duplicated Verbs'.)
- (11) In Compound Verbs (see *ante*, under 'Verb'), the second element agrees with the nominative, but the first is really the important one from the point of view of sense.
- (12) [nɔ] ন' is the negative particle in the dialect. It follows the verb generally.
- (a) The Past Habitual, followed by the negative to express the Future sense, is an established Future: [āi dzaitam nɔ] আই যাইতাম ন=আমি যাইব না 'I shall not go'.
- (b) The negative generally—it is the rule in the eastern part of the district—precedes the verb: [nɔ dzaium]

ন বাইয়ু 'I shall not go'; [nə dzaer] ন বায়ের 'do not go'; [nə gel] ন গেল 'did not go'. Most probably it is a Chittagongese construction, and peculiar to the contiguous and allied Chittagong dialect of Bengali, and hence it is not so much in evidence in the western part of the area.

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE SONGS OF GOVINDADAS

BY

BISWAPATI CHOUDHURI, M.A.

Ramtanu Lahiri Research Assistant, Calcutta University.

All the Vaisnava poets have suffered more or less in the hands of the Vaisnava anthologists, most of whom had to jot down the songs verbatim, as they were sung by the Kirtanias.

Now, these Kirtanias, uneducated or half-educated men as they were, could not reproduce the songs correctly, partly because of their scanty knowledge of literary Bengali and partly because of their profession calling them to modernise the language of these songs to suit the taste and demand of their times.

But we think, with the exception of one or two Vaisnava poets, none has suffered more in the hands of these Kirtanias than the poet Govindadas. The reason is obvious. As all of us know, Govindadas was a perfect master of form and style. Besides, his profound knowledge in Sanskrit and Sanskrit poetics has made his style quite inaccessible to average educated men, not to speak of the uneducated and half-educated Kirtanias, with the result that most of the songs of Govindadas have been misrepresented by the musicians and misquoted by the Vaisnava anthologists.

Then again, the songs of Govindadas are mostly written in Brajabuli; and one cannot expect these uneducated Kirtanias to have any knowledge of this highly artificial language. In this respect, I think, none has suffered more in the hands of the Kirtanias and Vaisnava anthologists than the poet Govindadas and his ideal Vidyapati.

Here I have collected as many versions as possible, in regard to some of the songs of Govindadas, and compared the readings of the old Manuscripts with those of the published editions of the songs of the poet, and the published anthologies of Vaisnava songs.

In course of my research into the field of the old Manuscripts, to find out different versions of the songs of Govindadas, I have come across with many new songs of the poet, not to be found in the published anthologies of Vaisnava songs, such as the "Padakalpataru," the "Padamrita Samudra," the "Vaisnavapadalahari," the "Padakalpalatika," the "Gaurapadatarangini" and others, nor in the published editions of the songs of the poet, nor even in the "Aprakashita Padaratnabali" (অপ্রকাশিত পদরত্নাবলী), a collection of unpublished Vaisnava songs, edited by Mr. Satish Chandra Ray, M.A., and published by the Vangiya Sahitya Parishad of Calcutta.

Before quoting the unpublished songs of Govindadas, let us first of all note the different versions of the songs of the poet, which I think will be of some interest to the readers of Vaisnava literature.

1. Different readings in regard to the song—কাননে কুন্ডম
তোড়সি কাঁহে গোরি.....

আনন হেম সরোরুহ ভাষ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

আনন হেম কমল পরকাশ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari is not very clear in sense. The poet compares the face of Radha with a lotus. The expression 'সরোরুহ ভাষ' carries no sense. We think it should be 'ভাস' (floating) qualifying the noun সরোরুহ (lotus). In our old Manuscripts there is no hard and fast rule as to the use of the three 'S's'; and we think the 'ব' of the word 'ভাষ' should be 'স', in which case we get quite a clear idea of what the poet means to say, namely, that 'the face of Radha is like a floating golden lotus.' Of course

one might say that the word 'ভাব' is an abbreviation of the word 'আভাষ' (suggestion), in which case we get a sensible reading, meaning—"in the face of Radha there are enough suggestions of a golden lotus."

We get another version in the Calcutta University MS. No. 324, *i. e.*, 'আনন হেম কমল পরকাশ' 'Her face shone like a golden lotus.' This version is quite clear.

অপরূপ তিলফুল স্থললিত নাস—Vaishnavapadalahari.

নাসা কিংশুক কোরক নাশ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

পরিমলে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

সৌরভে—C. U. MS. No. 324.

সব তনু ফুটল চম্পক সম গৌরা—Vaishnavapadalahari.

সব তনু ফুটল চম্পক গৌর—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript, being more correct from the standpoint of rhythm.

পাণি কমল থল কমল উজোর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

পাণিক তল থল কমল উজোর—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Of the above two versions we prefer the latter. The version of the Padalahari says 'the lotus-like palms of her hands shone like two land-lotuses.' To compare a lotus with another lotus, is most inartistic. We think the latter version 'পাণিক তল থল কমল উজোর' 'the inner part of her palm resembles a land-lotus' is better. We get a similar idea in another song of Govindadas, *i. e.*, 'যো পদতল থল কমল উজোর।' 'Whose feet resemble land-lotuses.' Thus we think it should be পাণিক তল instead of পাণি কমল।

2. Different readings in regard to the song—স্বরধ্বনী তীর
তীর মাহা বিলসই etc.....

ধানশী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

স্বরট সারঙ্গ—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

বিলসই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

বিহরই—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

জয় শচীনন্দন ত্রিভুবন বন্দন—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

জয় শচীনন্দন পূরল আনন্দন—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari. The word পূরল has been used here as an adjective qualifying the noun 'আনন্দন'। But the word 'পূরল' is a verbal form. We think it should be প্রণ (পূর্ণ) instead of পূরল.

While on the other hand the version 'ত্রিভুবন বন্দন' is quite clear and significant. It means 'one adored in the three worlds'. So we prefer the version of the Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari to that of the University Manuscript.

কুঞ্জ নয়নে বরু লোর—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

কঞ্জ নয়নে বরু লোর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript. The word কুঞ্জ can never qualify the word নয়ন, though it has been used as an adjective qualifying the noun 'নয়ন' in such an authoritative work as the Padakalpataru. It should be কঞ্জ, as we find it in the version of the Calcutta University Manuscript No. 302. The word কঞ্জ means lotus; and the expression 'lotus eyes' is a very common metaphor in our Vaishnava literature.

The word 'কুঞ্জ নয়ন' (eyes like groves) is quite ridiculous. The word কুঞ্জ may also mean the 'tusk of an elephant,' but to compare eyes with the tusks of an elephant is even more ridiculous than the former. Thus the word কুঞ্জ can be rejected; and we can put the word কঞ্জ in its place.

3. Different readings in regard to the song—চিত চোর
গৌর অঙ্গ etc.....

তথ্যরাগ—Padakalpataru.

টোড়ী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

পূরণ তরুণ করুণ মেহ—Padakalpataru.

পুলক তরুণ অরুণ সেহ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

পুলক তরুণ করুণ মেহ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari. The song describes the physical beauty of Chaitanya. Now all of us know, Chaitanya was of a very fair complexion, so much so that he was called 'গৌর' (the fair). So to compare him with clouds can never be happy, though the same thing has been done in the Padakalpataru and the University Manuscript.

The version of the Vaisnavapadalahari is—'পুলক তরুণ অরুণ সেহ'. Here Chaitanya has been compared with the newly-risen sun. This is quite sensible and expressive, and quite in keeping with the idea of the previous line 'হেম বরণ হরণ দেহ'—'the complexion of his body surpassed the colour of gold.'

নিবিড় প্রেম সিন্ধুরা—Padakalpataru and

Vaishnavapadalahari.

নয়নে সলিল সিন্ধুরা—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Though both the above versions are quite sensible, we prefer that of the University Manuscript, being more in keeping with the character of Chaitanya, the subject of the song. The expression 'নিবিড় প্রেম সিন্ধুরা' (the deep ocean of divine love) is quite clear and happy; but we think the expression 'নয়নে সলিল সিন্ধুরা' (his eyes are the oceans of tears) is happier still.

ভাবে অবশ দিবস রাত্তি—Padakalpataru.

ভাবে বিরস দিবস রাত্তি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

অখিল ভুবন প্রেমে ভাসে—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

অখিল ভুবন আনন্দে ভাসে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Both the above versions are faulty from the standpoint of rhythm. Let us wait till we can find a better version in any other old MS.

প্রেম সিন্ধু বন্ধুয়া—Vaishnavapadalahari.

প্রেম সিন্ধু বিন্দুয়া—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the MS. The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari is not at all clear in sense. The expression 'প্রেম সিন্ধু বন্ধুয়া' (the friend of the ocean of love) is not at all happy. The previous line is 'আশ করত গোবিন্দদাস।' 'Govindadas expects.' Now adding the line 'প্রেম সিন্ধু বন্ধুয়া' to this, we get, the following idea :—

"Govindadas expects the friend of the ocean of love," which is not at all sensible and clear. But if we add the version of the Manuscript to it, we get quite a clear and sensible reading :—'Govindadas expects a drop from the ocean of love.' So we can accept this version in preference to that of the Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

4. Different readings in regard to the song—কাঞ্চন যুথী কুন্ডল লই গোরী, etc.....

কাঞ্চন যুথী কুন্ডল লই গোরী—Padakalpataru.

কাঞ্চন জ্যোতি কুন্ডলময়ী গোরী—C. U. MS. No. 324.

কাঞ্চন জ্যোতি কুন্ডল সম গোরী—C. U. MS. No. 327.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru. The next line is 'নিরমতি মুরতি যতন করি তোরি'—'Radha is making an image of yours with utmost care.' Adding this line to the version of the Padakalpataru 'কাঞ্চন যুথী কুন্ডল লই গোরী' 'with the help of Kanchan, Juthi and

other flowers,' we get quite a sensible reading, namely — 'Radha is making an image of yours with the help of Kanchan, Juthi and other flowers.' To make images with the help of flowers was a very common art with the lovers of our old literature. As regards the other two versions, they are not very happy. Separately they are all right, but in connection with the next line they are not very expressive.

নিরামত মুরতি যতন করি তোরি—C. U. MS. No. 327.

নিরমতি মুরতি যতন করি তোরি—C. U. MS. No. 324 and

Padakalpataru.

তুয়া অনুভাবে আলিঙ্গই তায় ।—Padakalpataru.

তুয়া অভিলাষে আলিঙ্গন তায় ।—C. U. MS. No. 324 and 327.

বৃকভানু কুমারী—C. U. MS. No. 324 and Padakalpataru.

বৃকভানু কিশোরী—C. U. MS. No. 327.

তুয়া পরশকি আশে—C. U. MS. No. 327.

তুয়া রস আশে—C. U. MS. No. 324 and Padakalpataru.

5. Different readings in regard to the song—চিকণ কালা
গলায় মালা বাজন নূপুর পায়, etc.....

চুড়ার ফুলে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

চুলের ফুলে—C. U. MS. No. 324.

মোহন বাঁশী মধুর মধুর বায়—Vaishnavapadalahari.

মোহন বাঁশী মধুর মধুর গায়—C. U. MS. No. 324.

শ্রীচরণে চঞ্চল মকর কুণ্ডল—Vaishnavapadalahari.

শ্রবণে চঞ্চল মকর কুণ্ডল—C. U. MS. No. 324.

The word শ্রীচরণে (in the feet) in the version of the Vaishnavapadalahari should be replaced by the word শ্রবণে

(in the ears) as we find it in the version of the University Manuscript, for কুণ্ডল is an ornament for ears and not for feet.

রাঙা উতপল—Vaishnavapadalahari.

রাতা উতপল—C. U. MS. No. 324.

6. Different readings in regard to the song—ঢল ঢল সজল
জলদ তনু শোহন.....

মোহন চরণ সাজ—Padakalpataru.

মোহন অভয় চরণ সাজ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

মোহন অভরন সাজ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the MS. No. 324, the other two versions being faulty from the standpoint of rhythm.

বিজুরী চমক জিনি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

বিজুরী চমক অতি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

নয়নে না হেরিয়ে আন—Padakalpataru and Padamrita-
samudra.

নয়নে না ধরয়ে আন—C. U. MS. No. 324.

সজনি যাইতে পেখলুঁ কান—Padakalpataru and Vaishnava-
padalahari.

সজনি যব ধরি পেখলুঁ কান—Padamritasamudra.

সজনি যো দিন পেখলুঁ কান—C. U. MS. No. 324.

ধরয়ে—Vaisnavapadalahari.

হেরই—C. U. MS. No. 324.

গোবিন্দদাস মিছই আশোয়াসনু—Vaishnavapadalahari.

গোবিন্দদাস কহয়ে স্তুন্দরি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

অবহ না মিলল কান—Vaishnavapadalahari.

অব তোহে মিলব কান—C. U. MS. No. 324.

7. Different readings in regard to the song—সুন্দরি তুহ
বড়ি হৃদয় পাষণ...

সঘনে জপয়ে হরি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

সঘনে ডাকয়ে হরি—C. U. MS. No. 327.

তুয়া ভাবে তরু দেই কোর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

চম্পক তলে দেই কোর—C. U. MS. No. 327.

ঝাঁট করি ভেটহ কান—Vaishnavapadalahari.

তুহঁ জানি ভেটব কান—C. U. MS. No. 327.

Of the above two versions we prefer the former, being more clear in sense.

গোবিন্দদাসের বাণী—Vaishnavapadalahari.

গোবিন্দদাস কহে—C. U. MS. No. 327.

তুরিত চলহ ধনি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

তুরিত চল সুন্দরি—C. U. MS. No. 327.

8. Different readings in regard to the song—কানু উপেখি
রাই মহীতলে লিখই.....

মহীতলে লেখই—Vaishnavapadalahari.

মহী লেখই—Padamritasamudra.

মহী লিখত—C. U. MS. No. 327.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari, the other two being imperfect in rhythm.

শ্যামরী হেরি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

কানুকো হেরি—C. U. MS. No. 327.

সখীক রাই পুছত—Vaishnavapadalahari.

রাই পুছত—C. U. MS. No. 327.

সো কহ ব্রজ নব রামা—Vaishnavapadalahari.

ইহ কোন ব্রজ নব রামা—C. U. MS. No. 324.

কোনি ছলব বর রামা—C. U. MS. No. 327.

Of the above three versions the version of the University MS. No. 324 is more sensible and more in keeping with the spirit of the song.

Srikrishna goes to Radha in the guise of a woman. Seeing him Radha asks one of her female attendants as to who that lady might be; this is the idea of the song.

Now the version 'সো কহ ব্রজ নব রামা' after "শ্যামরী হেরি সখিক রাই পুছত" is not at all clear and happy. The other version "কোনি ছলব বর রামা" is also not happy, though it is clear in sense. If at the first sight suspicion arises in the mind of Radha, the dramatic effect of the song suffers to a great extent. While on the other hand the version—"ইহ কোন ব্রজ নব রামা"—'Who this unknown woman of Braja may be' is quite clear and happy. So we prefer this version.

তুয়া স্তম্বী হোত—Vaishnavapadalahari.

তুয়া স্তম্বী হোয়ত—C. U. MS. No. 327.

যতনে আওত—Vaishnavapadalahari.

যতনে চলি আওত—C. U. MS. No. 324.

যতনে চলি আয়লি—Padamritasamudra.

পরশে ধনী জানল—Vaishnavapadalahari.

পরশ সঙ্গে জানল—Padamritasamudra.

পরশহি জানল—C. U. MS. No. 327.

পরশএও জানল—C. U. MS. No. 324.

করইতে কোর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

করতহিঁ কোর—C. U. MS. No. 324.

হেরত গোবিন্দদাস—Vaishnavapadalahari.

হেরই গোবিন্দদাস—C. U. MS. No. 324.

9. Different readings in regard to the song—পহিল সমাগম
রাধা কান.....

রতি রস মগন—Vaishnavapadalahari.

অতি রসে মগন—C. U. MS. No. 324.

দুহুঁক দরশনে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

দুহুঁ বিলোকনে—C. U. MS. No. 324.

গিরিধর বর কর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

গিরিবর ধর কর—C. U. MS. No. 324.

দুহুঁ পুলকাইত—Vaishnavapadalahari.

দুহুঁ তনু পুলকিত—C. U. MS. No. 324.

নয়ন লুটাইরে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

নয়ন ঢুলাইরে—C. U. MS. No. 324.

The expression নয়ন লুটাইরে is not at all happy. The word 'লুটান' is never found to express "a pair of half-closed dreamy eyes," which the poet means to describe here. The whole sentence is this :—

গদ গদ ভাষে

আলাপই দুহুঁ দুহুঁ

চুম্বনে নয়ন লুটাইরে।

"The happy pair are whispering in a low and heavy voice, while their dreamy eyes are half-closed when they exchange kisses."

Thus we see the word লুটাই (to stretch) is not at all happy. On the other hand the word 'ঢুলাই' is a very common expression to suggest eyes half-closed and dreamy owing to love and passion; and 'ঢল ঢল আঁখি' is a very common expression to suggest a pair of dreamy eyes in our Bengali literature.

10. Different readings in regard to the song—রঙ্গিনী সঙ্গে
তুঙ্গ মণি মন্দিরে.....

কুল গিরিরাজ

লাজ ঘন কণ্টক

ভেদি মরম পর হান।

Vaisnavapadalahari.

কুচ গিরিরাজ

লাজ ঘন কণ্ডুক

ভেদি মরম পর হান।

C. U. MS. No. 324.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Vaisnavapadalahari. Both the versions are quite clear in sense, but the version of the Vaisnavapadalahari is more deep and suggestive. Radha sees Krishna from the roof of the palace and falls in love with him at the very first sight.

This is the fact, which both the versions mean to express in their own figurative way; and we are to see which of them is more expressive and suggestive.

The version of the University manuscript says :—

কুচ গিরিরাজ

লাজ ঘন কণ্ডুক

ভেদি মরম পর হান।

“The arrow of love struck her heart piercing through her mountain-like heaving breast and her jacket.” This is too crude and unpoetic.

While on the other hand the version of the Vaisnavapadalahari is quite sensible and expressive. According to this version—“the arrow of love struck her heart inspite of the opposition put forward by her family reputation and her personal fear of shame.”

Radha is a married girl, and she comes of a very respectable and aristocratic family. Now to fall in love with Krishna for a married girl like her, is to go against her family reputation and tradition. Besides that, there

is also the fear of shame. This is what the poet means to say. Thus we see the version of the Vaisnavapadalahari is more suggestive and artistic.

তিরী বধ বিপুল কলঙ্ক—Vaisnavapadalahari.

ধনী বধ „ „ —C. U. MS. No. 324.

11. Different readings in regard to the song—গহন বিরহক লাগি.....

গহন বিরহ দুখ লাগি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

গহনক বিরহক লাগি—Vaisnavapadalahari.

গহন বিরহ গহ লাগি—Padamritasamudra.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript. The word ‘গহনক’ in the version ‘গহনক বিরহক লাগি’ is not correct from a grammatical point of view. In Maithili and Brajabuli, the suffix ‘ক’ is added to a noun in the genitive case. Now here the word ‘গহন’ (deep) is an adjective qualifying the word ‘বিরহ’ (separation). In Bengali or Maithili an adjective never takes the case or number of the noun it qualifies. So the word ‘গহন’ with the suffix ক is not correct according to our Bengali and Maithili Grammar.

The other version ‘গহন বিরহ গহ লাগি’ is not clear. The word ‘গহ’ is a peculiar word. The meaning is however clear if we take the word ‘গহ’ to mean ‘গ্রহ’. In that case the line may mean—“owing to the misfortune of separation.”

But we prefer the version of the University MS., *i.e.*, ‘গহন বিরহ দুখ লাগি’—‘Owing to deep sorrows of separation.’ This is quite clear and simple.

আকুল কান—Vaisnavapadalahari.

ব্যাকুল কান—C. U. MS. No. 324.

সো রস পরশ না পাই—Vaisnavapadalahari.

তুয়া পরশ না পাই—C. U. MS. No. 324.

ঘন ঘন লোড়ই অঙ্গ—Vaisnavapadalahari.

ঘন ঘন মোড়ই অঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 324 and Padamrita-samudra.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript and the Padamritasamudra. The word 'লোড়ই' do not suggest that idle movements of limbs which one displays in the time of passion. The word 'লোড়ই' means simply to shake. The whole stanza is this :—

‘মন মাহা মদন তরঙ্গ ।

ঘন ঘন মোড়ই অঙ্গ ॥’

‘There are waves of passion in his mind, and he is again and again twisting his limbs in intense passion.’

Thus we see, the word 'মোড়ই' (twisting) is most appropriate here.

কহতহি গদ গদ ভাষ—Vaisnavapadalahari.

কহত ভরম ময় ভাষ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

কহতহি ভরম ময় ভাষ—Padamritasamudra.

The version of the Padamritasamudra is faulty from the standpoint of rhythm; so we reject it. The two other versions, *i. e.*, those of the Vaisnavapadalahari and the C. U. MS. No. 324 are both perfect in rhythm and clear in sense. So at present we accept both of them in the absence of any better reading.

12. In the Padakalpataru we have the song 'আর কিয়ে কনক কম্বল তনু সুন্দরী, etc.....' attributed to the poet Govindadas. The Vaisnavapadalahari also attributes the song to the same poet; but in the Calcutta University Manuscript No. 324 we get the song with the name of Ballavadas in the colophon.

We cannot say anything definitely regarding the authorship of the song, till we consult other old Manuscripts.

কনক কষিল তনু সুন্দরী—Vaisnavapadalahari.

কনক মুকুর তনু সুন্দর—C. U. MS. No. 324.

আকুল কণ্ঠে ঘন রোয়—Padakalpataru.

মুকুল কণ্ঠে খেনে রোয়—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru. The expression ‘মুকুল কণ্ঠে’ is not at all happy. The word ‘মুকুল’ may be taken to mean ‘tender;’ but even then it is less expressive than ‘আকুল কণ্ঠে,’ ‘in a piteous tone.’ ‘To cry in a piteous tone’ is certainly more expressive than ‘to cry in a tender tone.’

বোলত—Padakalpataru.

কহতহি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

কান্নু ঐছে বিলপই—Padakalpataru.

কান্নু যব বিলপই—C. U. MS. No. 324.

প্রেমক রীত

বুঝই সংশয় ভেল

কহতহি গোবিন্দদাস ॥

Padakalpataru.

না বুঝলো ধাতু

ধনু মোহে লাগল

কহতহি গোবিন্দ দাস ॥

C. U. MS. No. 324.

13. Different readings in regard to the song—কুবলয় নীল
রতন দলিতাঞ্জন... ..

অলকা তিলকা ললিতানন চাঁদ—Vaisnavapadalahari.

অলকা তিলকা ললিতাঞ্জন চান্দ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

আয়ত রে নব নাগর কান—Vaisnavapadalahari.

আওত রে মম নটবর কান—C. U. MS. No. 302.

মধুরাধর পর হাস অতি মনোহর—Vaisnavapadalahari.

মধুরাধর হি হাস অতি মনোহর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Vaisnavapadalahari. It is more artistic and sweet from the standpoint of rhythm. The alliteration of পর with 'হর' of 'মনোহর' is very happy, and it adds to the music of the line.

তাহি অতি মুরলী বিরাজে—Vaisnavapadalahari.

তাহি অতি সুমধুর মুরলী বিরাজে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript. The word 'অতি' can never be used as an adjective to the noun 'মুরলী'. It is generally used to qualify an adjective, just in the same way as the word 'more' is used in English before an adjective to heighten its degree. It cannot be used before a noun to qualify it, as we find it in the version of the Vaisnavapadalahari. In the version of the University Manuscript it has been used before the adjective 'সুমধুর' 'sweet', to add to its degree.

ভাঙ বিভঙ্গিম—Vaisnavapadalahari.

ভাঙু ভঙ্গিম তাহি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

গজমতি ভাতি গমন অতি মন্থর—Vaisnavapadalahari.

গজবর গতি সম গমন সুমন্থর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript.

The version of the Vaisnavapadalahari is quite clear in sense, but it is very poor in expression. To explain the line we have to split it into two separate ideas, namely, (1) 'There was গজমতি (a kind of gem) shining on his head,' and (2) 'His movements were graceful.'

This is not at all happy. The second version gives us a complete idea in one sentence, namely 'His movements were as graceful as those of an elephant.' So we prefer it to the other.

Now let us quote the unpublished songs of Govindadas, we have found in the old Manuscripts. These songs are to be found neither in the Anthologies of Vaisnava songs, such as, the Padakalpataru, the Padakalpalatika, the Padamritasamudra, the Gourapadatarangini, the Vaisnavapadalahari and others, nor in the published editions of the songs of the poet, nor even in the Aprakasitapadaratnavali, a collection of unpublished Vaisnava padas, edited by Mr. Satishchandra Ray, M.A., and published by the Bangiya Sahitya Parishad.

14. Different readings in regard to the song—স্বরধুনী বারি
বারি ভরি চরত.....

ধানশ্রী—Vaisnavapadalahari.

দাক্ষিণাত্যশ্রী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কো জানি কাহে লাগি আধ সিকই—Vaisnavapadalahari.

কো জানে কাহে লাগি অভিসিকই—Padakalpataru.

কো জানে কি লাগি কাহে অভিসিকই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

লীলা বুঝই না পারি—Padakalpataru and

Vaisnavapadalahari.

লীলা কোই বুঝই না পারি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

তাহি দেই হাসি হাসি—Vaisnavapadalahari.

তাহি দেহ হাসি হাসি—Padakalpataru.

তহি দেহ পর হাসি হাসি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কো জানে কতহুঁ মুরতি পরকাশি—Padakalpataru and

Vaisnavapadalahari.

কো জানে কতহুঁ মুরতি বিকাশি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

হেরি সব চকিত—Vaisnavapadalahari.

হেরি হেরি চমকিত—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions the former is defective so far as its rhythm goes. In this respect the second version is quite all right; and since it is quite clear in sense we cannot have any objection in accepting it.

গোবিন্দদাস গুণ গান—Padakalpataru

গোবিন্দ গুণ গান—Vaisanavapadalahari.

গোবিন্দ কি কহব গুণ গান—C. U. MS. No. 302.

15. Different readings in regard to the song—জয় জয়
শ্রীকৃষ্ণ চৈতন্য নাম... ..

কলিযুগ মন্থন—Vaisnavapadalahari.

কলিযুগ মথন—C. U. MS. No. 302.

তেত্রিঃ অনুমানিয়ে—Vaisanavapadalahari.

তেত্রিঃ অনুভাবয়ে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

দুহুঁ পরমেশ—Vaisanavapadalahari.

পহুঁ পরমেশ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

এই রসে যাহার নাহিক বিশোয়াস—Padakalpataru and

Vaisanavapadalahari.

তাহে যেনা দেখি কোন জনের বিশোয়াস—C. U. MS. No. 302.

মলিন মুকুরে নাহি বিশ্বের বিকাশ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

মলিন মুকুরে নাহি বিন্দুর বিকাশ—Vaisanavapadalahari.

Of the above two versions we prefer the first. The second version—"মলিন মুকুরে নাহি বিন্দুর বিকাশ" is not very happy. Of course, the word "বিন্দু" may be taken here to mean 'nothing' and the whole sentence may be translated thus: "Nothing is reflected in an unclean mirror." But we think

the first version—"মলিন মুকুরে নাহি বিশ্বের বিকাশ"—"Reflection is impossible in a dull mirror" is more clear.

গোবিন্দদাস কহে তাহে কি বিচার ।

কোটি কলপে তার নাহিক নিস্তার ॥

Vaisnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

গোবিন্দদাস বুঝে বিচার ।

কোটি কলপে যে তার নাহিক নিস্তার ॥

C. U. MS. No. 302.

16. Different readings in regard to the song—জয় জগতারণ
কারণ ধাম.....

জগ মগ লোচন—Vaisnavapadalahari.

ডগ মগ লোচন—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The word 'জগ মগ' is absurd ; most probably it is a misprint. It should be 'ডগ মগ' as we find it in the version of the C. U. MS. No. 302.

গদ গদ আখ মধুর বচনামৃত—Vaisnavapadalahari.

গদ গদ মধুর মধুর বচনামৃত—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কলি যুগ কাল

ভুজঙ্গম দংশল

দগধল স্থাবর জঙ্গম দেখি ।

—Vaisnavapadalahari.

কলি যুগ কাল

ভুজঙ্গ দগধল

জঙ্গ খাবর দেখি ।

—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer the version of the Vaisnavapadalahari. The version of the University Manus-

cript is defective in rhythm, and the word ‘জন্ম’ the abbreviation of the word ‘জন্ম’ is not at all happy.

দাস গোবিন্দ কাহে উপেখি—Vaisnavapadalahari.

গোবিন্দ কাহে উপেখি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

17. Defferent readings in regard to the song—অরুণিত
চরণে রণিত মনিমঞ্জির

আধ পদ চললি রসাল—Vaisnavapadalahari.

আধ আধ পদ চললি রসাল—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer the latter. The version ‘আধ পদ চললি রসাল’ conveys no sense at all. It is all right when we get ‘আধ আধ পদ,’ for the expression ‘আধ আধ’ has got a suggestive meaning than what it literally means. It signifies grace and tenderness of movement. As “আধ আধ বুলি বোলে” will mean “He speaks very sweetly and tenderly” (like a child). But if there is only one ‘আধ’ instead of two ‘আধ’s (as it is in the second version) it will mean ‘half.’ Then again, the absence of the second ‘আধ’ in the version—“আধ পদ চললি রসাল” not only affects the sense, but tells much upon the rhythm. I think one “আধ” has been dropped in the Vaisnavapadalahari.

কাঞ্চন বঞ্চন বসন মনোরঞ্জন—Vaisnavapadalahari.

কাঞ্চন বঞ্চন বসন মনোরম—Padakalpataru.

কাঞ্চন গঞ্জন বসন মনোরম—C. U. MS. No. 302.

বলিত ললিত বনমাল—Vaisnavapadalahari.

অলিকুল মিলিত ললিত বনমাল—C. U. MS. No. 302.

ধনি ধনি মদন মোহনিয়া—Vaisnavapadalahari.

ভালে ধনী আওয়ে মদন মোহনিয়া—Padakalpataru.

ধনি ধনি আওয়ে মদন মোহনিয়া—C. U. MS. No. 302.

রঞ্জিম ভঞ্জিম নয়ন নাচনিয়া—Vaisnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

ভঞ্জিম গীম নয়ন নাচনিয়া—C. U. MS. No. 302.

অধর সুরঙ্গিণী—Vaisnavapadalahari.

অধর সুধাধর—Padakalpataru.

অধর সুধাধর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

মুরলী তরঙ্গিণী—Vaisnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

মুরলী তরঙ্গিম—C. U. MS. No. 302.

গোরোচন তিলক—Vaisnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

রোচন তিলক—C. U. MS. No. 302.

চুড়ে বালচন্দ্র বেঢ়ল—Vaisnavapadalahari.

চুড়াপর চন্দ্রক—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript. It is not only clearer in sense, but also more correct in rhythm.

18. Different readings in regard to the song—কুন্দন কনয়া
কলেবর কাঁতি.....

রাগ সুহই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

তথা রাগ—Padakalpataru.

রাগ সুহই—Vaisnavapadalahari.

পুলক পাঁতি—Padakalpataru and Vaisnavapadalahari.

পুলকের পাঁতি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

জপে জপাতে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

জপিয়া জপায়ে—Padakalpataru.

জপি জপায়ে—Vaisnavapadalahari.

গাইয়া গাওয়ায় আপন গুণ গান—Vaisnavapadalahari.

গাইয়া গাওয়ায়ে আপন গুণ গাম—Padakalpataru.

গাওয়ায়ে গাওয়ায়ে আপন গুণ গাম—C. U. MS. No. 302.

বধির জড় অন্ধ—Padakalpataru and Vaisnavapadalahari.

বধির যত অন্ধ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru and Vaisnavapadalahari.

হেনই পেখলু কতহি পরবন্ধ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কতহি না পেখলু ঐছন পরবন্ধ—Padakalpataru and
Vaisnavapadalahari.

আপনহু ভোর ভুবন করু ভোর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

আপনি ভোর ভুবন করু ভোর—Padakalpataru and
Vaisnavapadalahari.

গোবিন্দদাস কহে যাউ বলিহারি—Vaisnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

গোবিন্দদাস তহি যাউ বলিহারি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

...

19. Different readings in regard to the song—চম্পক শোন
কুসুম কনকচল.....

দাক্ষিণাত্য শ্রীরাগ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

সারঙ্গ—Vaisnavapadalahari.

গৌরী—Padamritasamudra.

ত্রিভুবন মগুন—C. U. MS. No. 302.

ত্রিভুবন বন্দন—Vaisnavapadalahari.

নিজ রসে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

নিজ গুণে—Padamritasamudra.

ভকতহি মেলি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

ভকত মেলি—Vaisnavapadalahari.

20. Different readings in regard to the song—কলি
তিমিরাকুল অখিল জীব হেরি.....

গৌরাস্ত করুণাসিন্ধু অবতার—Padakalpataru.

গৌর করুণাসিন্ধু অবতার—Vaisnavapadalahari.

গৌর আমার করুণাসিন্ধু অবতার—C. U. MS. No. 302.

জগ জনে পরায়লি হার—Padakalpataru.

জগতে পরাওলি হার—C. U. MS. No. 302.

যছু পদতলে—Padakalpataru.

তুছ পদতলে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

21. Different readings in regard to the song—পুলক বলিত
অতি ললিত হেম তনু.....

অবধি নাহি পাইয়ে—Vaisnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

অবধি নাহি পাবই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

প্রেম সিঞ্চু বহ নয়নহি লোর—Padakalpataru.

প্রেম সিঞ্চু বহ নয়ন হিলোল—C. U. MS. No. 302.

প্রেম সিঞ্চু সহ নয়ন হিঁ লোর—Vaisnavapadalahari.

Of the above three versions we prefer those of the University Manuscript and the Padakalpataru, both of which convey the same sense, namely "tears are flowing like the waves of the ocean of love." The version of the Vaisnavapadalahari—প্রেম সিদ্ধু সহ নয়নহি লোর—is not at all happy. We cannot find out any sense in the expression—"tears are flowing with the ocean of love." (প্রেম সিদ্ধু সহ নয়নহি লোর)

হাসি ক্ষণে রোয়ই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

হাসি ক্ষণে রোষই—Vaisnavapadalahari.

Of the above two versions we prefer the former. Chaitanya was mad with divine love, this is what the poet means to say in this poem. Now he is shedding tears, in the next moment he is laughing. This is quite natural with a man of Chaitanyas temperament. But what could made him angry? So we think the word 'রোষই' (as we find it in the version of the Vaisnavapadalahari) should be 'রোয়ই,' as we have it in the version of the University Manuscript. The Padakalpataru also gives us "রোয়ই" instead of "রোষই।"

প্রেম ভরে গর গর—Vaisnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

প্রেম রসে গদ গদ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

ইহ রস সাগরে—Padakalpataru.

ইহ স্তূধা সাগরে—Vaisnavapadalahari.

ও রস সাগরে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

দিন রজনী নাহি জান—Padakalpataru.

দিন রজনী নাহি জানি—Vaisnavapadalahari.

দিন রজনী নাহি আন—C. U. MS. No. 302.

বিন্দু লাগি রোয়ত—Vaisnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

বিন্দু লাগি কান্দয়ে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

22. Different readings in regard to the song—পতিত হেরিয়া
কান্দে স্থির নাহি বাঞ্চে.....

রাগ স্তহই—Vaishnavapadalahari and C. U. MS. No. 302.

তথা রাগ—Padakalpataru.

পতিত হেরিয়া কান্দে—Padakalpataru and

C. U. MS. No. 302.

পতিতে হেরিয়া কান্দে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

স্থির নাহি বাঞ্চে—Padakalpataru.

থির না বাঁধে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

স্থির নাহি বাঁধে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

অবনী ঘন পড়ি যায়—Vaishnavapadalahari.

অবনী ঘন গড়ি যায়—Padakalpataru.

অবনীতে ঘন গড়ি যায়—C. U. MS. No. 302.

গৌরাজের নিছনি লইয়া মরি—Vaishnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

গৌরা পছঁর নিছনি লই মরি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

তিল আধ পাসরিতে নারি—Vaishnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

তিলেক পাসরিতে নারি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কমলা শিব বিধি

দুর্লভ প্রেমনিধি

দান করয়ে জগজনে—Padakalpataru and

Vaishnavapadalahari.

কমলা শিব

বিরিঞ্চি দুর্লভ প্রেম

দান করয়ে জগজনে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

23. Different readings in regard to the song—জন্মদ তনু
বদন অম্বুজ.....

বদন অম্বুজ—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

বয়ান অম্বুজ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

তরুণ প্রেম ভরে

দিন রজনী নাচত

অরুণ চরণ অধির—Vaishnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

ভরল প্রেম ভরে

দিন রজনী নাচত

অরুণ চরণ অধির—C. U. MS. No. 302.

নীল বরণ গভীর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

অরুণ নিলয় গভীর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

নিলয় বরণ গভীর—Padakalpataru.

কবছ' নাচত

কবছ' গাওত

কবছ' গদ গদ ভাষ—Vaishnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

ভাবে টল মল

অঙ্গ বাল মল

মধুর মধুরিম হাস—C. U. MS. No. 302.

অখিল জগ জনে

প্রেম পূরল

বঞ্চিত গোবিন্দদাস—Vaishnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

বচন গদ গদ

আধ আধ পদ

বদত গোবিন্দদাস—C. U. MS. No. 302.

24. Different readings in regard to the song—প্রেমে
চল চল কনয়া কলেবর.....

প্রেমেতে চল চল কনয়া কলেবর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

প্রেম চল চল নয়ন কলেবর—Vaishnavapadalahari,

নট রসে ভেল ভোর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

নটন রসে ভেল ভোর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari, being more correct in rhythm.

সভাই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

সবে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

পুলকে পুরল তনু—Vaishnavapadalahari.

পুলকে দ্বিগুণ তনু—C. U. MS. No. 302.

গুপত প্রেমধন

জগভরি বিলাওল

পুরল সবছ'ক আশ।

—Vaishnavapadalahari.

হসত হাসনি

মধুর ভাষনি

পাষণে মিলাইয়া যায়।

—C. U. MS. No. 302.

সো প্রেমসিকু

বিন্দু নাহি পাওল

পামর গোবিন্দদাস।

—Vaishnavapadalahari.

অখিল জনমন

প্রেমে পুরল

দাস গোবিন্দে ভায়।

—C. U. MS. No. 302.

25. Different readings in regard to the song—পদতলে
ভকত কলপতরু.....

নয়ন নীরদ জিনি

কত মন্দাকিনী

ত্রিভুবন ভরল তরঙ্গে।

—C. U. MS. No. 302.

নব নীরদ জিনি

কত মন্দাকিনী

ত্রিভুবন ভরল আনন্দে ।

—Vaishnavapadalahari.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript. The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari is not at all happy. The sentence—"কত মন্দাকিনী ত্রিভুবন ভরল আনন্দে"—has got no connection with the previous line—"নব নীরদ জিনি"—and the whole sentence is not at all clear in sense. But if we accept the version of the University Manuscript, we get quite a sensible reading.—The version is this—

নয়ন নীরদ জিনি

কত মন্দাকিনী

ত্রিভুবন ভরল তরঙ্গে ।

"His eyes are like new clouds, whence endless torrents of tears like so many heavenly rivers have overflowed the three worlds." This is quite clear, and we cannot have any objection in accepting it, in preference to the other version.

নিত্যানন্দ চন্দ্র

অভিরাম দিনমণি ।

—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

নিত্যানন্দ রায় দিনমণি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কাঁদাই—Vaishnavapadalahari.

কান্দাই—Padakalpataru.

কান্দয়ে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কি কহিব—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

কি কহিব—C. U. MS. No. 302.

26. Different readings in regard to the song—নিরুপম
হেম জ্যোতিবরণা.....

সঙ্গীত রঞ্জিত তরঙ্গিত চরণা—Padakalpataru.

সঙ্গীত রঞ্জিত রঞ্জিত চরণ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

সঙ্গীত রঞ্জিত নন্দিত চরণা—C. U. MS. No. 302.

নাচত গৌর গুণমণিয়া—Padakalpataru.

নাচত গৌরচন্দ্র গুণমণিয়া—Vaishnavapadalahari.

নাচত রে গৌর গুণমণিয়া—C. U. MS. No. 302.

অমিয়া বঞ্চিত দাস গোবিন্দ—Padakalpataru.

মহী মাংসা বঞ্চিত দাস গোবিন্দ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

মহিমা বঞ্চিত দাস গোবিন্দ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

27. Different readings in regard to the song—নিশসি
নিহারসি ফুটল কদম্ব.....

এ ধনি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

এ সখি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

অরু—Vaishnavapadalahari.

আন—C. U. MS. No. 324.

আন ছলে অঙ্ক নয়ান ছলে পঙ্খ—Padakalpataru.

আন ছলে অঙ্গন আন ছলে পঙ্খ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

আন ছলে অঙ্ক নয়ান ছলে পঙ্খ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript. The other two versions are not at all clear in sense. While on the other hand the version of the Manuscript is as clear as it is happy and suggestive—"The home (অঙ্গন) has got its own influence on Radha, while the way

(to the grove of her lover) casts a different sort of charm on her.”

28. Different readings in regard to the song—মধুর মধুর
তুয়া রূপ.....

মো তনু—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

সুতনু—C. U. MS. No. 324.

সুন্দরি মোহে না কর আন ছন্দ—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

এ সখি ইথে নহ ছন্দ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

হাম বনি যাও—Padakalpataru.

হাম বনি যাওব—C. U. MS. No. 324.

কানু য়েছে তুয়া বশ হোই—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

হরি য়েছে তুয়া পথ হোই—C. U. MS. No. 324.

তবহুঁ সফল দিন মোর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

তবহুঁ সফল তনু মোর—C. U. MS. No. 324.

রাই শুতব যব কানুক কোর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

যবহুঁ শুতব হরি কোর—C. U. MS. No. 324.

হাম পৈঠব কালিন্দী বারি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

বরু পৈঠব হাম যমুনাক বারি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

তবহি পূরব মনোরথ তোহারি—Padakalpataru.

তবহি মনোরথ পূরব হামারি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

বক্ষিম নয়ন নেহারি—Padakalpataru.

রঞ্জিম নয়ন নেহারি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

The unpublished songs of Govindadas :—

1. দেখ সখি অদভূত রঙ্গ ।
 রমণী বেশ ধরি নাগর কানাঞি
 আওত যুবতীক সঙ্গ ॥
 আঙু পদ বাম বাম পদ চলনি
 বাম কুণ্ডল অনুপাম ।
 শিরে সিঁথি করি কাম সিন্দূর পরি
 আজু লখিল নহে শ্যাম ॥
 পদতলে অরুণ কিরণ হাম পেখল
 তেঞি মনে কৈলুঁ অনুমান ।
 গোবিন্দদাস কহে রসিক শিরোমণি
 রাধা ঘরে করল পয়ান ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 327.

2. সুন্দরি কৈছে করবি অভিসার ।
 হরি রহ মানস সুরধুনী পার ॥
 মন্দিরে বাহিরে কঠিন কপাট ।
 চলইতে শঙ্কিল পঙ্কিল বাট ॥
 এ সখি ঘন ঘন বজর নিপাত ।
 শুনইতে শ্রবণে মরমে জ্বলে গাত ॥
 তাহে অতি দাস্তরী দর দর রোল ।
 বারিক বিহনে নলিনী নিচোল ॥
 ইথে যদি সুন্দরি তেজবি গেহ ।
 পেমের লাগি উপেখবি দেহ ॥
 গোবিন্দদাস কহে এতেক বিচার ।
 হটন বান কি যতনে নিবার ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 327.

কেদার রাগ

3. চলল নিকুঞ্জে কুঞ্জর বর গমনী ।
 যুবতী যুথ মেলি গাওত বাওত
 চলত চিত্রপদ বিদগধ রমণী ॥
 নব যৌবনী ধনী জগ জিনি লাবণী
 মোহিনী বেশ বানাওলি তায় ।
 মনমথ চিত ভীত নাহি মানত
 কুঞ্জ রাজ পর মাজনি রাই ॥
 বনি বনবীর ধীর সহচরী মেলি
 বরিথয়ে নয়ন কুসুম শর জ্বালা ।
 হেরইতে শ্যাম সুরত রণ পণ্ডিত
 হাসি মদন মদে মাতলি বালা ॥
 বয়ানে বয়ানে ভুজ ভুজ বন্ধনে
 তনু তনু পুলকিত নাহি যায় ভঙ্গ ।
 গোবিন্দদাস আপনা নাহি সমরুহ
 বাজত কিঙ্কণী কলোল তরঙ্গ ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 327.

4. বালা রমণী রমন নাহি দেল ।
 বহুত মিনতি কান্নু কইল ॥
 রাই কর ধরি কহলহি নাথ ।
 কাহেকো মোহে কর হরষ বিষাদ ॥
 চরণে লাগি কয়ল পরগাম ।
 নব যৌবনী তব হেরই কান ॥
 কঙ্ক বিলোকনে মধুর মৃদু হাস ।
 মগন দুহুঁক মন গোবিন্দদাস ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

5.

বিহাগড়া

তেজহ দারুণ মান মানিনি
 নাহ গাহক তোরি রে ।
 তুহু সে মরকত মুরতি কামিনী
 কাচ কাঞ্চন জোরি রে ॥
 তো বিনে সুখময় শেজ তেজই
 নিন্দ চন্দন চন্দ রে ।
 শুতল ভূতল লুটহি কুন্তল
 কাম চামরু বন্ধ রে ॥
 নীল উতপল লুটহি কুন্তল
 ঘাম ঝামরু দেহা ।
 কুহুম শরে শর বরিখে ঝর ঝর
 নয়ন শাঙন মেহা ॥
 এ তুয়া লোচন বিরহ বিমোচন
 কোনে হেরবি কান রে ।
 রায় চম্পতি বচন মানহি
 দাস গোবিন্দ ভণে ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 327.

6.

যতনহি মাধব রতিরস কেলি ।
 নব যৌবনী পরিরস্তন দেলি ॥
 নুনিক পুতলী ধনী জর জর ভেলি ।
 কমল নয়ান মলিন তৈ গেলি ॥
 চর চর নয়ন চরকি বহে লোর ।
 যতনে মাধব করলহি কোর ॥
 দুহু জন কহে খর সুপরবন্ধ ।
 গোবিন্দদাস হেরি রহু ধন্ধ ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

7. পহিল মিলনে রাই কানুক কোর ।
 মান মরকতে জন্ম লাগল জোর ॥
 জন্ম ভেল চাঁদ চকোর একু সঙ্গ ।
 কনক কমলে জন্ম মাতল ভুঙ্গ ॥
 প্রেম রভস রসে মাতল বালা ।
 নব জলধরে জন্ম দামিনীক মালা ॥
 গোবিন্দদাস বচন কহু ভাল ।
 হেম জড়ল জন্ম তরুণ তমাল ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

8.

কেদার

মাধব, কি কহব তুয়া অনুরাগ ।
 তুয়া অভিসারে অবশ ভেল নাগরী
 জীবহুঁ রহু পুণ ভাগ ॥ ধ্রু ॥
 যো পদতল থল কমল কোমল
 ধরনী পরশ উপচক্ষ ।
 অব কণ্টকময় আওত যাওত নিশঙ্ক ॥
 ভীতহি চিত ভুজগ হেরি যো ধনী
 চমকি উঠয়ে ঘন কাঁপি ।
 অব আঁখিয়ারে আপন তনু বাঁপই
 কর দেই ফণী বাঁপি ॥
 মন্দির মাঝে শেজ নাহি তেজই
 দেহলি মানয়ে দূর ।
 অব কুহু যামিনী চললু একাকিনী
 গোবিন্দদাস কহু ফুর ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

9.

শ্রীরাগ

কান কুঞ্জে কুসুম শর জর জর
 কানু হেরত পথ তোরি ।
 ভাগে মিলি পুন কাহে কমলমুখি
 রোখে চললি মুখ মোরি ॥
 শুন স্তম্ভরি জানলু—
 তুয়া দুঃখভাগ ।
 হরি উর মুকুরে হেরি নিজ ছা হেরি
 কিয়ে সৌতিনী করি মান ॥
 কত শত মুগধী ঐছে ভেল বঞ্চিত
 হরি পুন তাহে না লাগি ।
 তুহুঁ পুণবতী ভাগী তুহি মানয়ে
 কি কহব তোহারি সোহাগী ॥
 তো হেরি ন শুভল শীতল ভূতলে
 ছুতর বিরহ হতাশে ।
 তুয়া কর সরস পরশে সমুঝায়হ
 তোহে কহে গোবিন্দদাসে ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

10.

শ্রীগাঙ্কার

কত কত আদরে
 ভরি করু কোর ।
 ঘন ঘন চুষনে
 যাঁহা নাহি ওর ॥
 এ ধনি কি ফল
 ঐছন লেহ ।
 বরু বিরহানলে
 জারউ দেহ ॥

তেখনে মঝু মনে
 লাগল ধন্ধ ।
 সো পরিরন্তনে
 আনহি ভেল ছন্দ ॥
 কহত ভরম ময়
 ভরমক বাণী ।
 অধর সূধা ভেল
 কাজিক পানি ॥
 অবকি হসি হসি
 পিরীতি নেহারি ।
 তো হেরি সো আসব
 কোন গোড়ারী ॥
 গোবিন্দদাস কহ
 হসত গোরী ।
 মুরলীক গানে
 হোত যব ভোরি ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

11.

ধানশ্রী

দেখ সখি নাগর নাহ সূজান ।
 কুন্তল পিঞ্জ চরণ নিরমঞ্জন
 অব কিয়ে সাধবি মান ॥
 মুঞি জানউ হরি রাইকে পরিহরি
 সপনছঁ আন ন জান ।
 বিদগধ বাদে কোই পরিবাদর
 তেঞি কিএ তেজবি কান ॥

যাকর মুরলী আলাপহিঁ কত কত
কুলরমণী ভোরি ।

তুহারি প্রেম ভরে বাত নাহি কহতহি
অতএ কি মানসি হোরি ॥

প্রেমক দহনে প্রেমপত্র শীতল
অনহি হোত আন ।

চন্দন চন্দ সো তনু তাপই
গোবিন্দদাস রস গান ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

12.

ଦ୍ଵିତୀୟାଂଶ

মধুর মুরলী শব্দ করসি
নয়নে দরশি প্রেম ।

ঈষৎ হাসিতে অমিঞা পরশি
বচনে বরষি হেম ॥

ଏହିନ କୁଳ ଶିଳ ଧରମ ଗରସି
ହରଷି ସ୍ତ୍ରଗଧୀ ନାରୀ ।

তরুণী সব তরী নিরমিত
মদন সায়েরে বারি ।

কো কহে মালতীক কো কহে মাধবীক
কৈছন ভরম সোই ।

মো পুণি জানলো শ্যাম ভ্রমর
কবছ আপন হোয় ॥

তবহুঁ মালতী কবহুঁ পিরীতি
 থাকর নিজ বশ দেহ ।

সহজে পরবশ যুগধ মাধবী
কি ফল তাকর লেহ ।

অতএ আপনে আপনি মূরছলৌ।
 সমুঝি এ সব কাজ ।
 মূরছিত মাধবী কি সাধ সাধবি
 বিজয়ী মদনরাজ ॥
 চলহ সুন্দর বিনোদ মন্দির
 সুন্দর সুন্দরী পাশ ।
 এ সব তোহারি সুন্দর চরিত
 গায়ত গোবিন্দদাস ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

13.

বেলোয়ার

শুনি সখী সুবচন মনে অনুমান ।
 নাগরী বেশ বনায়ত কান ॥
 আগুপদ বাম বাম গতি চাহনি
 বামে কুণ্ডল জগ অনুপামা ।
 বাম ভুজে বসন উড়ায়ত ঘন ঘন
 বামা আজি পেখলুঁ শ্রামা ॥
 পট অম্বর পরি অতি নব নাগরী
 এই বেশে কয়ল পয়ান ।
 চারু শিখা করি কাম সিন্দূর পরি
 লখএ না পায়ল কান ॥
 এমন চতুর বর কভু নাহি দেখিএ
 এ মহী মণ্ডল মাঝ ।
 মানময় কঙ্কন দুহুঁ ভুজে সাজল
 কহতহি গোবিন্দদাস ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324

14.

গাঙ্কার

দেখ রাধা মাধব মেলি ।
 মুরত মদন রস কেলি ॥ প্র ॥
 ও নব জলধর অঙ্গ ।
 ইহ থির বিজুরী তরঙ্গ ॥
 ও তনু তরুণ তমাল ।
 ইহ হেম বিজুরী রসাল ॥
 ও বর মরকত ভাণ ।
 ইহ কাঞ্চন দশবাণ ॥
 ও মত মধুকর রাজ ।
 ইহ নব পটুমিনী সাজ ॥
 ও মুখ চন্দ্র উজোর ।
 ইহ দেখি লুন্ধ চকোর ॥
 গোবিন্দদাস রহু ধন্ধ ।
 অরুণ নিয়ড়ে জন্ম চন্দ ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

15.

ধানশ্রী

পুনহু কহত গোকুল চন্দ ।
 বিহসি বিহসি মধুর মন্দ ।
 কহে বল্লভ সুন্দরীবৃন্দ ॥
 কহত নাহি বাতিয়াই ।
 অবনত আনন আচরে গোই ॥
 আকুল অমল কুল ফোই ।
 অধিক অধিক গতি খোই ॥
 অনিমিখ অন-বরত রোই ।
 অয়রিপু অনুরাগিণী রাই ॥

অনুপম অভরণ অঙ্গে না ধরই ।
 অলকত অঞ্জন অন্তর জর জরই ॥
 অবনিক অঙ্গ অলঙ্কর গৌরী ।
 গোবিন্দদাস অন্তর ভোরি ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 324.

16.

শ্রীরাগ


কোচার শোভায় মদন ভূলে ।
 হেরিয়া যুবতী না রহে কুলে ॥
 সরুয়া কাকালি ভাঙ্গিয়া পড়ে ।
 তাহে তনুস্থ বসন পরে ॥
 চাচর কেশের লোটন দেখি ।
 কোন ধনী তাহে যৌবন রাখি ॥
 ভালের উপরে চন্দন ফোঁটা ।
 রসিয়া নাগরী গরব কাটা ॥
 লোল বিলোলিতে ঈষৎ হাসি ।
 কুলবতী ব্রত নাশিবে বাসি ॥
 নিতম্ব মণ্ডলে কাম রহি ।
 ইছিয়া নিছিয়া পরাণ দি ॥
 তাহে কোন হার যৌবন লাগে ।
 গোবিন্দদাসের মরমে জাগে ॥

Calcutta University MS. No. 302.

17.

গান্ধার

আজু রাধা স্বাধীনা ভেল ।
 মরমহি কত পরকার বুঝায়নু
 তব ধনী উত্তর না দেল ॥



A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE SONGS OF GOVINDADAS

By

BISWAPATI CHOUDHURY, M.A.

In this short thesis I have dealt with as many as thirty-four songs of Govindadās comparing the readings of old MSS. with those presented by the published anthologies of Vaishnava songs. I have also included two new songs of Govindadās, not to be found in any of the published anthologies, such as, the Padakalpataru, the Padakalpalatikā, the Vaishnavapadalaharī, the Padāmritasamudra, etc. Even Mr. Satishchandra Roy, M.A., has not incorporated these two songs in his famous work—the Aprakāshita-padaratnāvalī, a collection of unpublished Vaishnava songs, published by the Bangiya Sāhitya Parishad.

1. Different readings in regard to the song —

প্রিয়সখী গমন করল প্রতি কানন.....

The song is not to be found in the Padakalpataru, the Padāmritasamudra, the Padakalpalatikā or any other published anthology of Vaishnava songs. The only published edition where we get it is the Vaishnavapadalaharī. The same song with different readings has however been found in the Calcutta University MS. No. 303. Now let us compare the reading of the MS. with that of the Vaishnavapadalaharī.

(a) প্রিয় সখী গমন করল প্রতি কানন—C. U. M^s. No. 303.

প্রিয়সখী গমন করল প্রতি বনেবন—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

(b) সুশীতল বারি—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

নীল সুশীতল—C. U. MS. No. 303.

যাঁহা হরি সুবল সখা করু কোর ।
 সহচরী পথ হেরি অন্তর গর গর
 ঢর ঢর নয়নকি লোর ॥
 সচকিত নয়নে নেহারই সহচরী
 আকুল শ্যামরু চন্দ ।
 রঙ্গ পটাস্বরে মুখরুচি মোছই
 বসন ঢুলায়ত মন্দ ॥
 কর্পূর তাষূল বদনহি পুরল
 সচকিত ভেল পীতবাস ।
 সুন্দরী গমন করল অব নিকটহি
 কহতহি গোবিন্দদাস ॥

2. Different readings in regard to the song—শিরোপরি
 খারি যতন করি ধরলহি.....

(a) ধানশী—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.
 ভূপালী—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(b) যশোমতী বচন কহল সব গুরুজনে—
 Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

তাকর বচন কহল যত গুরুজনে—C. U. MS. No. 303.

The song as found in the MS. begins with—

যশোমতী তুরিতে পাঠাওল সহচরী
 রাই মন্দিরে চলি গেল ।

So the word 'তাকর' in the next line is quite significant here. But the song in the Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari begins with—

শিরোপরি খারি যতন করি ধরলহি
 বাহক মন্দিরে চলি গেল ।

Here “যশোমতী বচন” is required instead of “তাকর বচন.”

(c) স্তব্দরী সখী সঞে করল পয়ান—

Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

তব ধনী সখী সঞে করল পয়ান—MS. 303.

(d) কাঞ্চন কিরণ বরণ নহ সমতুল—Padakalpataru.

কাঁচা কাঞ্চন বরণ নহ সমতুল—Vaishnavapadalahari.

কাঞ্চন বরণ চম্পক নহ সমতুল—MS. 303.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari. The other two versions are equally clear in idea, but do not give us as perfect a rhythm as we get it in the version of the Padakalpataru. It may be held that the genuineness of the version of a poem is not to be ascertained by its rhythmic perfection which may be a later improvement—but in the case of Govindadas—that perfect master of rhythmical art, I think that argument will not hold good.

(e) বচন জিনিয়া পিক বাণী—Vaishnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

বচন কহই পিকবাণী—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(f) করপদ-তল থল- কমল দলারুণ—Padakalpataru.

পদতল থল- কমল স্নকোমল—Vaishnavapadalahari.

পদতল স্নকোমল কমল দলারুণ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(g) রুণু বুণু মঞ্জীর বাজে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

মঞ্জীর রুণু বুণু বাজে—Padakalpataru and University

MS. No. 303.

(h) জিতল মনমথ রাজে—Padakalpataru and Vaishnava-

padalahari.

জিতল বিদগধ রাজ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

Now let us give the whole song as it stands after additions and alterations have been made in accordance with the suggestions proposed by us.

ধানশী ।

শিরোপরি থারি যতন করি ধরলহি
 রাইক মন্দিরে গেল ।
 যশোমতী বচন কহল সব গুরুজনে
 সো অব অনুমতি দেল ॥
 হৃন্দরী সখী সঞে কয়ল পয়ান ।
 রঙ্গ পটাস্বরে বাঁপল সব তনু
 কাজরে উজল নয়ান ॥
 দশনক জ্যোতি মতি নহ সমতুল
 হসইতে খসই মণি জানি ।
 কাঞ্চন কিরণ বরণ নহ সমতুল
 বচন জিনিয়া পিকবাণী ॥
 পদতল স্নকোমল কমল দলারুণ
 রুণু ঝুণু মঞ্জীর বাজে ।
 গোবিন্দ দাস কহ অপরূপ হৃন্দরী
 জিতল বিদগধ রাজে ॥

3. Different readings in regard to the song—রাতক নীল
 বসন কাহে পিঙ্ক.....

(a) রাতক নীল বসন কাহে পিঙ্ক—C. U. MS. No. 303.

নীল বসন কাহে পিঙ্ক—Padakalpataru and Vaishnava-
 padalahari.

Of the above two versions we would prefer that of the University MS. In this song we find that a suspicion has arisen in the mind of Jashomatī, the mother of Krishna as to the conduct of his son, Krishna. Here she is complaining against the unusual late rising of Krishna, and asks why he was still wearing his night-dress when it was almost noontime. This is what we get from the version—“রাতক নীল

বসন কাহে পিন্ধ।” (Why are you still wearing your night's blue cloth) ? The other version, *i.e.*, the version of the Padakalpataru, “নীল বসন কাহে পিন্ধঃ” is meaningless here. There is nothing unusual in one's wearing a blue cloth during day time. So we prefer the version of the Manuscript.

The suggestion of this poem is that Krishna according to Jashomatī had worn the blue apparel of Balaram by mistake, whereas in truth he had in his nocturnal revelry taken the blue *sari* of Rādhā for his own.

(b) অরুণ উদয় ভেল না ভাঙ্গল নিন্দ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

উদিত অরুণ নাহি ভাঙ্গল নিন্দ—Padakalpataru.

অরুণ উদয়ে নাহি ভাঙ্গল নিন্দ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(c) অঙ্গ বিভঙ্গ কতয়ে তনু মোড়—Padakalpataru.

অঙ্গ বিভঙ্গ করতহি মোর—C. U. MS. No. 303.

Of the above two versions that of the Padakalpataru seems correct. The version of the MS. seems faulty. It is not in keeping with the idea of the previous line—“ব্রজকুল চান্দ নিছনি যাঙ তোর।” All these are said by Jashomatī, Krishna's mother. So the expression—“অঙ্গবিভঙ্গ করতহি মোর”—carries no sense here.

(d) ফাগু ভরল কিয়ে লোচন ওর—Padalahari.

ফাগু অরুণ কিয়ে লোচন ওর—Padakalpataru.

ফাগু অরুণ কিয়ে লোচন জোর—C. U. MS. No. 303.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the MS. No. 303.

(e) কাঁহা লাগল হিয়া কণ্টক আঁচড়—Vaishnavapadalahari.

কাঁহা লাগল হিয়ে কণ্টক আঁচোর—Padakalpataru.

কাঁহার লাগল হিয়ে কণ্ঠ আঁচোর—C. U. MS. No. 303.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru. The version of the University Manuscript carries no sense at all. The word 'হিয়া' as we find it in the version of the Padalahari should be 'হিয়ে' which we get in the version of the Padakalpataru.

(f) বামরু ভেল নীল উতপল দেহ—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

বামরু নীল নব নব উতপল দেহ—MS. No. 303.

(g) না জানি পাপ দিটি দেয়ল কেহ—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

না জানি দিটি দরশয়াল কেহ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

Of the above two versions we prefer the former. The second version is not very clear.

(h) তবহুঁ ভুঞ্জব দধি ওদন এহ—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

তবহুঁ ভুঞ্জব দধি ওদন দেহ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

We prefer the former version.

(i) এতহুঁ কহল যব যশোমতী ভাষ—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

এতহি শুনল যব যশোমতী ভাষ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(j) গোবিন্দ দাস কহ ব্রজ অধিদেবী—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

গোবিন্দ দাস কহে শুন ব্রজদেবী—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(k) উনহি নিরাপদ গৌরীক সেবি—C. U. MS. No. 303.

পুনহি নিরাপদ গৌরীক সেবি—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University manuscript. The word 'পুনহি' has got no significance here. It should be 'উনহি' (He) as we find it in the version of the University MS. In this song we find that Krishna's mother Jashomatī suspects that her son must have fallen a prey in the hands of some evil spirit, otherwise why should he look so pale and sick? The poet Govindadās consoles her saying—"উনহি নিরাপদ গৌরীক সেবি"—"He is quite safe in his love with Gaurī." This is quite clear in sense. The other version—"পুনহি নিরাপদ গৌরীক সেবি" carries no sense at all. The word 'পুনহি' means 'again'.

Now let us give the whole song as we get it after the suggestions made above have been carried out.

রামকলী

রাতক নীল বসন কাহে পিন্ধ ।
উদিত অরুণ নাহি ভাঙ্গল নিন্দ ॥
ব্রজকুল চান্দ নিছনি যাঙ তোর ।
অঙ্গ বিভঙ্গ কতছঁ তনু মোড় ॥
ফাণ্ড অরুণ কিয়ে লোচন জোর ;
কাঁহা লাগল হিয়ে কণ্টক আঁচোড় ॥
ঝামরু ভেল নীল উতপল দেহ ।
না জানি পাপ দিঠি দেয়ল কেহ ॥
মঙ্গল সিনান করব আজু গেহ ।
তবছঁ ভুঞ্জাব দধি ওদন এহ ॥
এতছঁ শুনল যব যশোমতী ভাব ।
আঁচরে বারি নিবারল হাস ॥
গোবিন্দ দাস কহে ব্রজ-অধিদেবি ।
উনহি নিরাপদ গৌরীক সেবি ॥

4. Different readings in regard to the song—

“বেণুক ফুক বুক মদনানল.....

(a) তথ্যরাগ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

বরাড়ী—Vaishnavapadalapari.

হৌ-রাগিনী—Padakalpataru.

(b) বেণুক ফুক বুক মদনানলে

কুল ইক্ষনমে জোরি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

বেণুক ফুকে বুক মদনানল

কুল ইক্ষন মাহা জারি—' adakalpataru.

বেণুক ফুক মুকে মদনানল

কুল ইক্ষন মাহা জারি—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(c) দরশন পানি দুহু পরশে সোহায়ল

শ্রমজল জারণ বারি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

দরশন পানি দুহু পরশে সোহাগল

শ্রমজলে জোরল বারি—Padakalpataru.

দরশে পানি দুহু পরশে সোহায়ল

শ্রমজলে জোরল বারি—C. U. MS. No. 303.

Of the above three versions, we prefer that of the University MS. This version produces a more happy rhythmical effect than what we get in the other two versions. Such finish in rhythm is typical of Govindadas, who is a perfect master of that subtle art.

(d) নব অনুরাগ রঞ্জে পুণ রঞ্জল

সীম না জানয়ে কোই—Vaishnavapadalahari.

নব অনুরাগ রঞ্জল পুণ রঞ্জই

খেলন না জানই কোই—C. U. MS. No. 303.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari. The poet says—‘Both Krishna and Rādhā have,

for the first time, experienced the pleasure of love. So their enjoyment knew no bounds.' This is roughly the idea we get in the version—

“নব অনুরাগ রঞ্জে পুণ রঞ্জল
সীম না জানয়ে কোই।”

The other version—"খেলন না জানই কোই"—is not so clear.

(e) গুরুজন নয়ন চোর পথ ছাপিয়ে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

গুরুজন নয়ন চোর পরে ছাপিয়ে—Padakalpataru.

গুরুজন নয়ন ডরহি নিতি ছাপই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari. The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari says—"The thief (Krishna) comes unnoticed by the superiors."

Now let us give the whole song as we get it after all the above suggestions have been carried out.

বরাডী

বেণুক ফুক বুক মদনানলে
কুল ইকনমে জোরি ।
দরশে পানি দুহু পরশে সোহায়ল
শ্রমজলে জোরল বারি ॥

সজনি কানু সে শৈল সোণার ।

মবু মন কাঞ্চন আপন প্রেমধন
জোরি পিধায়ল হার ।

নব অনুরাগ রঙ্গে পুন রঞ্জল
সীম না জানয়ে কোই ।

শুরুজন নয়ন চোর পথ ছাপিয়ে
প্রাণনাথ সো গোই।

যো রস আগরি বিদগধ নাগরী
 হেরতহি তাকর সাধ ।
 গোবিন্দদাস কহ আন আন বচন
 হোয়ে জনি পরমাদ ॥

5. Different readings in regard to the song—পেখনু রে
 সখি যুগল কিশোর.....

(a) কেদারা—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

শ্রীরাগ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(b) নব নব রূপ নিরুপম লাবণী

মরকত কাঞ্চন কাঁতি—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahari.

সম বয় রূপ নিরুপম লাবণী

মরকত কাঞ্চন ভাতি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript. The poem begins with the line.—“পেখনু রে সখি যুগল কিশোর”—and the central idea of the song is that both Krishna and Rādhā are equally young and beautiful. So the expression ‘সম বয় রূপ’ is more suggestive and significant than the expression—“নব নব রূপ ।”

(c) নারী পুরুষ দৌহে লেখই না পারিয়ে

—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

নারী পুরুষ দৌহে লেখই না পারিয়ে

—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The version of the University Manuscript is correct. The word ‘লেখই’ seems to be a misprint. It should be ‘লেখই’ as we get it in the version of the Manuscript.

(d) সঘনে উদিত আধ মেলি—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

সঘন উদিত অব মেলি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(e) গোবিন্দদাস কহই অপরূপ—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

গোবিন্দদাস কহ ইহ সব অপরূপ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(f) নব রাধা মাধব কেলি—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

রাধা মাধব কেলি—C. U. MS. No. 303.

We prefer the former version. The version of the University Manuscript is defective in rhythm.

Now let us give the whole song—

কেদার

পেখমু রে সখি যুগল কিশোর

কালিন্দী তীর নিকুঞ্জক ওর ॥

সম বস রূপ নিরূপম লাবণী

মরকত কাঞ্চন কাঁতি ।

নারী পুরুষ দৌহে লখই না পারই

অছু পরিরন্তন ভাঁতি ॥

ঘন ঘন চুম্বনে লুবধ মদন দুহু

বিগলিত স্বেদ উদবিন্দু ।

হেরি হেরি মরম ভরম পরিপূরল

কো বিধুমণি কোই ইন্দু ॥

সিন্দূর অরুণ বদনে বিধুমণ্ডল

সঘনে উদিত আধ মেলি ।

গোবিন্দদাস কহ ইহ সব অপরূপ

নব রাধা মাধব কেলি ॥

Govindadas was a great Sanskrit scholar, yet he uses the word लावणी a corrupt form of लावण्य. This shows that the great Vaishnava masters created new melodies by giving flexible forms to rigid classical words.

6. Different readings in regard to the song—স্বরত পিয়াসে ধরল পছঁ পাণি.....

(a) ভূপালী—Vaishnavapadalahari, Padakalpataru and Padāmritasamudra.

বিহাগড়া—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(b) স্বরত পিয়াসে ধরল পছঁ পাণি—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

স্বরত পিয়াসে ধরলহি পাণি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

স্বরত তিয়াসে ধরল পছঁ পাণি—Padāmritasamudra.

(c) হঠ পরিরন্তুণে পরবশ গাত—Padāmritasamudra.

হঠ পরিরন্তুণে পরশিত গাত—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

হঠ পরিরন্তুণে শিহরিত গাত—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript.

(d) নহি নহি বলি ঢুলায়ত মাথ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

নহি নহি বলি ধুনাযত মাথ—Padāmritasamudra.

নহি নহি বলি রোকত হাত—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(e) চুশনে সচকিত লোচন তার—Padakalpataru.

চুশনে সঙ্কোচই লোচন তার—C. U. MS. No. 303 and Padāmritasamudra.

চুশনে সঙ্কোচ লোচন তার—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(f) অভিনব মদন তরঙ্গিনী রাই ।

শ্যাম মাতঙ্গ রঙ্গে অব গাই ।—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

অভিনব মদন তরঙ্গিনী রাই ।

শ্যাম তরঙ্গে রঙ্গে অঙ্গ অবগাই ॥—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The entire song is now given below.

ভূপালী ।

স্বরত পিয়াসে ধয়ল পল্ পাণি ।
করে কর বারই তরল নয়ানী ॥
হঠ পরিরম্ভে শিহরিত গাত ।
নহি নহি বলি ঢুলায়ত মাথ ॥
অভিনব মদন-তরঙ্গিনী রাই ।
শ্যাম মাতঙ্গ রঙ্গে অবগাই ॥
চুম্বনে সঙ্কোচ লোচন তার ।
পীবইতে অধর রচই শীৎকার ॥
নখর পরশে ধনী চমকই গোরাী ।
দংশইতে চমকি উঠই তনু মোড়ি ॥
কহইতে কহ গদ গদ পদ আধ ।
আন আন মনে মনসিজ উনমাদ ॥
তৈখনে রাখত বহি পরসাদ ।
গোবিন্দদাস কহ রস পরিবাদ ॥

7. Different readings in regard to the song—চৌদিকে চকিত
নয়নে ঘন হেরসি.....

(a) চৌদিকে চকিত সঘনে অব হেরসি

ঝাঁপসি ঝাঁপল অঙ্গ ।—C. U. MS. No. 303.

চৌদিকে চকিত নয়নে ঘন হেরসি

ঝাঁপসি অঙ্গ ।—Padakalpataru and Padalahari.

(b) কাঁহা শিখলি ইহ রঙ্গ—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

কাঁহা শিখলি রঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions the former is more perfect in rhythm.

(c) শ্যাম স্তনাগর গুপত প্রেমধন
জাননু হিয়া মাহা সাঁচি ।—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

শ্যাম স্তনায়র গুপত প্রেমধন
জাগল হিয়ামাহা সাঁচি ।—C. U. MS. No. 302.

We think the version of the University MS. is more expressive. A female attendant of Rādhā says—“It is quite certain that the secret love of Shyāma has made its way into your heart.” This is quite clear. The other version—“জাননু হিয়া মাহা সাঁচি” is not clear.

(d) এ তুয়া হাস- পরম পরকাশই—Padakalpataru.
এ তুয়া হাসি মরমক পরকাশই—Vaishnavapadalahari.
এ তুয়া হাস মরম পরকাশই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Let us now give the whole song as we get it after all the above suggestions, for additions and alterations, have been carried out.

বিতাস ।

চৌদিকে চকিত নয়ানে ঘন হেরসি

ঝাঁপসি ঝাঁপল অঙ্গ ।

বচনক ভাঁতি বুঝই না পারিয়ে

কাঁহা শিখলি ইহ রঙ্গ ॥

সুন্দরি কি কেল পরিজনে বাঁচি ।

শ্যাম স্তনাগর গুপত প্রেমধন

জাগল হিয়া মাহা সাঁচি ॥

এ তুয়া হাস মরম পরকাশই
 প্রতি অঙ্গ ভঙ্গিম সাখি ।
 গাঠিক হেম বদন মাহা ঝলকই
 এতদিনে পেখনু আঁখি ॥
 গমন মনোরথে পশু না হেরসি
 জিতল মনমথ রাজ ।
 গোবিন্দ দাস কহই ধনি বিরমহ
 মৌনহি বুঝনু কাজ ॥

8. Different readings in regard to the song—যাঁহা দরশনে
 তনু পুলকে না ভরই.....

- (a) যাঁহা কর পরশনে টুটত বোলাই—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 যাঁহা কর কর সবে টুটত বলাই—Padakalpataru.
 যাঁহা কর পরশনে হটত বলই—C. U. MS. No. 303.

We can reject the version of the Padakalpataru. It is not at all clear. The other two versions are equally sensible and clear.

- (b) যাঁহা নখ বিলিখনে ছুছ তনু দলই—Vaishnavapadalahari
 and Padakalpataru.
 যাঁহা নখ লিখনে ছুছ তনু ঝলকই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The version of the University MS. is defective in rhythm. We prefer the other version.

- (c) যাঁহা মণি নূপুর তরলিত কলই—Padakalpataru.
 যাঁহা মণি মঞ্জির তরলিত কলই—C. U. MS. No. 302.
 যাঁহা নখ নূপুর তরলিত কলই—Vaishnavapadalahari.

The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari is defective. The expression 'নখ-নূপুর' is absurd.

(d) যাঁহা নাহি ঐছন রস নীরস হই—Padakalpataru.

যাঁহা নাহি ঐছন রস নীর হই—Vaishnavapadalahari.

যাহা নাহি ঐছন রস নীর বহই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the University MS. The other two versions are not at all clear in sense. The version—“যাঁহা নাহি ঐছন রস নীরস হই” is not at all in keeping with the spirit of the whole song. In this song Rādhā describes how the very sight of Krishna fills her heart with pleasure and how his sweet touch can destroy all evils. The whole poem is saturated with this idea. The line “যাঁহা নাহি ঐছন রস নীরস হই” is not at all in harmony with the general idea of the whole song. The next line is—“তাঁহা পরিবাদ গোবিন্দদাস কহই” the poet says—“where such a stream of emotion flows, scandal is sure to spread out there.” This is the idea we get from the version of the University MS. and it is quite clear. The idea we get from the version of the Padakalpataru is—“scandal is sure to spread out there, where such a flow of emotion dries up.” This is absurd. In this connection it should be noticed that the word ‘নাহি’ (used once in every line of this song) is not a term indicating negation of something. It is a mere ‘মাত্রা’ as we call it in Bengali.

Let us now give the whole song, as we get it after all these additions and alterations, suggested above, have been made.

বরাড়ী

যাহা দরশনে তনু পুলকে না ভরই ।

যাহা কর পরশনে টুটত বালাই ॥

যাহা পরিরন্তনে অম্বর খলই ।

যাহা ঘন চুম্বনে বদন না টুটই ॥

এ সখি মানিয়ে হরি সঞে মেলি ।

যব হোয়ত হেন মনোভব কেলি ॥

- (e) বৃন্দা বচনে সকল পক্ষীগণ
 মধুর মধুর করু ভাষ ।—Padakalpataru.
 বৃন্দাদেবী সনে সকল সখীগণ
 মধুর মধুর করু ভাষ ।—C. U. MS. No. 302.
 বৃন্দাদেবী সব সখীগণে জনে জনে
 মধুর মধুর করু ভাষ ।—Vaishnavapadalahari.

Let us now give the whole song after carrying out the suggestions made above.

বিভাস

নিশি অবশেষে জাগি সব সখীগণ
 বৃন্দাদেবী মুখ চাই ।
 রতিরস আলসে শুতি রহু দুহু জন
 তুরিতহি দেহ জাগাই ॥
 তুরিতহি করহ পয়ান ।
 রাই জাগাই লেহ নিজ মন্দিরে
 নিকটহি হোয়ত বিহান ॥
 শারী শুক পিক সকল পক্ষীগণ
 তুহু সব দেহ জাগাই ।
 জটিল গমন সবহু মেলি ভাগই
 শুনইতে জাগই রাই ॥
 বৃন্দাদেবী সব সখীগণে জনে জনে
 মধুর মধুর করু ভাষ ।
 মন্দির নিকটহি ঝারি লই ঠারই
 হেরতহি গোবিন্দদাস ॥

10. Different readings in regard to the song—সময় জানি
সখী মিলল আই.....

- (a) সময় জানি সব মিলল আই ।
আনন্দে মগন দুহুঁ দুহুঁ মুখ চাই ॥—Vaishnavapadalahari.
সময় জানি সখী মিলল আই ।
চান্দনী রজনী দুহুঁ দুহুঁ মুখ চাই ॥—C. U. MS. No. 303.
সময় জানি সখী মিলল আই ।
চান্দনী রজনী আনন্দে সবাই ॥—Padakalpataru.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript.

- (b) নীল গিরি বেড়ি কিরে কনকের মালা—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.
নীল গিরি বেড়িল কি বিজুলাক মালা—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (c) গোরী মুখ সুন্দর বালকে রসালা—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.
গোরী বদন চান্দ বালকে রসালা—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (d) আনন্দে মগন ভেল দুহুঁ মুখ চাই—Padakalpataru.
আনন্দে ভরল তনু দুহুঁ মুখ চাই—Vaishnavapadalahari.
আনন্দে মোহন দুহুঁ দুহুঁ মুখ চাই—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (e) গোবিন্দদাস কহ শুনি পরমাদ—Padakalpataru.
গোবিন্দদাস পহুঁ শুনি পরমাদ—Vaishnavapadalahari.
গোবিন্দদাস পহুঁ শুনে পরমাদ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The whole song is now given below after all these suggestions have been carried out.

বিভাস

সময় জানি সখী মিলল আই ।

চান্দনী রজনী দুহুঁ দুহুঁ মুখ চাই ॥

দুহু জন সেবন সখীগণ কেল ।
 চৌদিকে চাঁদ হেরি রহি গেল ॥
 নীল গিরি বেড়ি কিয়ে কনকের মালা ।
 গোরী মুখ সুন্দর ঝলকে রসালা ॥
 বানরী রব দেই কক্খটী নাদ ।
 গোবিন্দদাস পহুঁ শুনি পরমাদ ॥

11. Different readings in regard to the song—গুরুজন
জাগল ভৈগেল বিহান.....

- (a) কো সখী দধি মস্থন করু যাই—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 কোই সখী দধি মস্থন করু তাহি—Padakalpataru.
 সখীগণ দধি মস্থন করু তাহি—C. U. MS. No. 303.
- (b) ঘন ঘন গরজন উপমা নাই—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahari.
 ঘন ঘন ধ্বনি তাহে উপমা নাই—C. U. MS. No. 303.
- (c) কনক কুস্ত লই কোই চলি গেল ॥
 —Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.
 গাগরী ভরনে কোই ষমুনায় গেলি—C. U. MS. No. 303.
- (d) কুসুম তোরি কোই গাঁথই হার—Vaishnavapadalahari and
 Padakalpataru.
 কুসুম তোড়ল কেহ গাঁথলি হার—C. U. MS. No. 303.
- (e) নিতি নিতি করতহিঁ ঐছন রীত—Vaishnavapadalahari
 and Padakalpataru.
 নিতি নিতি নব নব ঐছন রীত—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(f) গোবিন্দদাস কহে অনুপ চরিত—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

গোবিন্দদাস পহঁ অনুপম চরিত—C. U. MS. No. 303.

The version of the University MS. is defective in rhythm.
We prefer the other version.

12. Different readings in regard to the song—নীরদ নয়ন
নব ঘন সিঞ্চনে পূরল মুকুল অবলম্ব.....

(a) শ্রীরাগ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

ধানশী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(b) নীরদ নয়ানে নীরঘন সিঞ্চনে

পুলক মুকুল অবলম্ব ।—C. U. MS. No. 302 and

Padakalpataru.

নীরদ নয়ানে

নব ঘন সিঞ্চনে

পূরল মুকুল অবলম্ব ।—Vaishnavapadalahari.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Pada-
kalpataru. The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari is faulty.
The expression ‘পূরল মুকুল অবলম্ব’ is not at all clear in sense.

(c) অভিনব হেম কল্লতরু

স্বরধুনী তীরে উজোর—Padakalpataru.

অভিনব হেম

কল্লতরু সঞ্চরু

স্বরধুনী তীরে উজোর ।—Vaishnavapadalahari

and C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Uni-
versity MS. The other version is quite clear in sense, but
is defective in rhythm.

- (d) চঞ্চল চরণ তলে ঝঙ্কর
 ভকত ভ্রমরগণ ভোর ॥—Vaishnavapadalaharī.
 চঞ্চল অরণ চরণ তলে ঝঙ্কর
 ভকত ভ্রমর বিভোর ॥—C. U. MS. No. 302.
 চঞ্চল চরণ কমলতলে ঝঙ্কর
 ভকত ভ্রমরগণ ভোর ॥—Padakalpataru.

The version of the Vaishnavapadalaharī is defective in rhythm. The version of the University manuscript is quite clear in sense, but the version of the Padakalpataru is more happy. When the worshippers of Krishna have been compared to so many humming bees, the feet of Krishna should be compared to a pair of lotuses. The version of the Vaishnavapadalaharī is also defective in the same sense.

Now let us give the whole song as we get it after the above suggestions have been carried out.

শ্রীরাগ

নীরদ নয়ানে নীর ঘন সিঞ্ঝনে
 পুলক মুকুল অবলম্ব ।
 শ্বেদ মকরন্দ বিন্দু বিন্দু চুষত
 বিকশিত ভাব কদম্ব ॥
 কি পেখনু নটবর গৌর কিশোর ।
 অভিনব হেম কল্লতরু সঞ্চর
 সুরধুনী তীরে উজোর ॥
 চঞ্চল চরণ কমলতলে ঝঙ্কর
 ভকত ভ্রমরগণ ভোর ।
 পরিমল লুবধ সুরাসুর খাবই
 অহর্নিশি রহত আগোর ॥

অবিরত প্রেম রতন ফল বিতরণে
 অখিল মনোরথ পূর ।
 তাকর চরণে দীনহীন বঞ্চিত
 গোবিন্দদাস রহু দূর ॥

13. Different readings in regard to the song—সহজই
 কাঞ্চন গোরা.....

- (a) বদন মনোহর বয়সে কিশোর—Padakalpataru.
 মদন মোহন বয়সে কিশোর—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 মদন মোহন তনু বয়সে কিশোর—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (b) বিহ্বল পুলক অবলম্বে—Padakalpataru.
 বিপুল পুলক আনন্দে—C. U. MS. No. 302.
 বিপুল পুলক অবলম্বে—Vaishnavapadalahari.
- (c) পূরল জগজন আশ—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahari.
 পূরল জগমন অভিলাষ—C. U. MS. 302.

The version of the University MS. is defective in rhythm.
 So we prefer the other version.

- (d) প্রতি অঙ্গে তরঙ্গিত ভাবের আবেশ—Padakalpataru.
 প্রতি অঙ্গে তরঙ্গিত রসের আবেশ—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 প্রতি অঙ্গে পুলকিত রস ভাবাবেশ—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (e) বঞ্চিত ভেল তহি গোবিন্দদাস—Vaishnavapadalahari
 and Padakalpataru.
 গাওত বঞ্চিত গোবিন্দদাস—C. U. MS. No. 303.

সুহই

সহজই কাঞ্চন গৌরা ।
 মদন মোহন বয়সে কিশোরা ॥
 তাহে ধরু নটবর বেশ ।
 প্রতি অঙ্গে তরঙ্গিত ভাব আবেশ ॥
 নাচত নবদ্বীপচন্দ্র ।
 জগমন নিমগন প্রেম-আনন্দ ॥
 বিপুল পুলক অবলম্বে ।
 বিকশিত ভেল তঁহি ভাব কদম্বে ॥
 নয়নে গলয়ে ঘন লোর ।
 ক্ষণে হাসে ক্ষণে কাঁদে ভকতহি কোর ॥
 রসভরে গদ গদ বোল ।
 চরণ পরশে মহী আনন্দ-হিল্লোল ॥
 পূরল জগমন আশ ।
 বঞ্চিত ভেল তহি গোবিন্দদাস ॥

13. Different readings in regard to the song—দেখত বেকত
 গৌর চন্দ্র.....

(a) দেখত কত গৌর চন্দ্র—Padakalpataru.

দেখত বেকত গৌরচন্দ্র—C. U. MS. No. 302 and

Vaishnavapadalahari.

The version of the Padakalpataru is faulty. The word 'কত' seems to be a misprint. It should be 'বেকত' (ব্যক্ত), as we find it in the other version.

(b) ফিরত অবনী মাতিয়া—C. U. MS. No. 302.

তরখিত মহী মাতিয়া—Vaishnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

14. Different readings in regard to the song—আজু
শচীনন্দন নব অভিষেক.....

- (a) শ্রীরাগ—C. U. MS. No. 302.
ভৈরবী—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.
- (b) বরিখয়ে সবহুঁ নয়ন ঘন মেহা—Padakalpataru.
বরিখয়ে সবহুঁ নয়ন যেন মেহা—Vaishnavapadalahari.
বরিষে নয়ন সব শাওন মেহা—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (c) নিরখিতে নিরুপম কাঞ্চন দেহা—Vaishnavapadalahari.
হেরইতে নিরুপম কাঞ্চন দেহা—Padakalpataru.
হেরইতে অনুপম কাঞ্চন দেহা—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (d) বঞ্চিত গোবিন্দদাস পরসঙ্গে—Padakalpataru.
বঞ্চিত গোবিন্দ সো পরসঙ্গে—Vaishnavapadalahari.
বঞ্চিত গোবিন্দ পহুঁ পরসঙ্গে—C. U. MS. No. 302.
-

15. Different readings in regard to the song—নীলাচলে
কনকাচল গোরা.....

- (a) পুলকে কদম্ব করম্বিত অঙ্গ—Vaishnavapadalahari.
পুলকে কদম্ব শিহরিত অঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (b) প্রেম সুধাসিন্ধু মুরতি জন্ম—Vaishnavapadalahari.
প্রেমানুসিন্ধু মুরতি জন্ম—Padakalpataru.
প্রেম সুধাসিন্ধু ক্ষরত জন্ম—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (c) ফাগু তরুণ তনু অরুণহ চীর—Padakalpataru.
ফাগু অরুণ তনু অরুণহি চীর—Vaishnavapadalahari and
C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (d) কণ্ঠহি লোলিত অরুণিত মাল—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
কণ্ঠহি লোল অরুণ মাল—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The version of the University MS. is defective in rhythm.
We accept the other version.

- (e) নয়ন ঢুলাঢুলি প্রেম তরঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 302.
নয়ন ঢুলাওত প্রেম তরঙ্গ—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
(f) কত কত ভাবে বিথারল অঙ্গ—Vaishnavapadalahari.
নব নব ভাবে বিথারল অঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

বসন্ত

নীলাচলে কনকাচল গোরা ।
গোবিন্দ ফাগুরঙ্গে ভেল বিভোরা ॥
দেবকুমারী নারীগণ সঞে ।
পুলকে কদম্ব করস্থিত অঙ্গে ॥
ফাগুয়া খেলত গৌরতনু ।
প্রেম সুধাসিন্ধু মুরতি জন্ম ॥
ফাগু অরুণ তনু অরুণহি চীর ।
অরুণ নয়ানে ঝরে অরুণহি নীর ॥
কণ্ঠহি লোলিত অরুণিত মাল ।
অরুণ ভকতগণ গায় রসাল ॥
কত কত ভাবে বিথারল অঙ্গ ।
নয়ন ঢুলাঢুলি প্রেম তরঙ্গ ॥
হেরি গদাধর লহ লহ হাস ।
সো নাহি সমুঝল গোবিন্দদাস ॥

16. Different readings in regard to the song—নীলরতন
কিয়ে নব ঘনঘটা.....

- (a) রূপ দেখি আইনু জাতি কুল মজাইয়া—Vaishnavapadalahari.
রূপ হেরি বাহিরিনু জাতি কুল বিকাইয়া—C. U. MS. No. 324.
- (b) অধর বাঁধুলি কিয়ে কিশলয় ছাঁদ—Vaishnavapadalahari.
অধর কিশলয় কিয়ে বাঁধুলি বন্ধ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the
Vaishnavapadalahari.

- (c) তাহে অতি সুমধুর মুরলী গানে—Vaishnavapadalahari.
তাহে অতি সুমধুর মুরলী রসানে—C. U. MS. No. 324.
- (d) নয়ান যুগল কিয়ে মত্ত অলিরাজ ।
অলখিতে দংশয়ে সুবতী হিয়া মাঝ—Vaishnavapadalahari.
নয়ান যুগল কিয়ে ভ্রমর বিরাজ ।
অলখিতে দংশয়ে সুবতী হিয়া মাঝ—C. U. MS. No. 324.
- (e) গোবিন্দদাস কহে সেন-দিঠি বিষে—Vaishnavapadalahari.
গোবিন্দদাস কহে সে না দিঠি বিষে—Padāmritasamudra.
গোবিন্দদাস কহে ও না আঁখি বিষে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

17. Different readings in regard to the song—সজল
জলধর অঙ্গ মনোহর.....

- (a) সজল জলধর অঙ্গ মনোহর
ছটায় চাহিল নহে ।—Aprakāshitapadaratnāvali
and Vaishnavapadalahari.
- সজল জলধর অঙ্গ মনোহর
ছটায় চাহিল নহে ।—C. U. MS. No. 324.

The version of the University Manuscript gives us a more perfect rhythm.

- (b) ঈষৎ হাসিয়া মনের আকুতে
 অরুণ নয়নে চাহে ॥—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 ঈষৎ হাসিয়া মনের আকুতি
 অরুণ নয়নে কহে ॥—C. U. MS. No. 324.
- (c) কি আজ পেখনু বর বিনোদ নাগর
 কেলি কদম্বের তলে ।—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 কি রূপ দেখিনু বর শ্যাম স্ননাগর
 কেলি কদম্ব তরু তলে ।—C. U. MS. No. 324.
- (d) বকুল মালা দিয়া কুন্তল টানিয়া—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 বৌল মালা দিয়া কুন্তল বাঁধিয়া—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (e) রঙ্গিনী লোচন খঞ্জন বাঁধিতে
 পাতিল বিষম ফাঁদে ।—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 লোচন খঞ্জন রঙ্গিনী বাঁধিতে
 পাতিল বিষম ফাঁদ ।—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript.

18. Different readings in regard to the song—মদন কিরাত
 কুসুম শরে জর জর.....

- (a) শ্রীরাগ—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.
 শ্রীগাঙ্কার—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (b) মদন কিরাত কুমুম শরে জর জর
বৃন্দাবন বন মাঝ ।—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

মদন কিরাত কুমুম শর জর জর
বৃন্দাবন-রস-রাজ ।—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (c) সুন্দরী তুয়া দিঠি অখিল সন্ধান—Padakalpataru.
এ সখি তুয়া দিঠি অখির সন্ধান—C. U. MS. No. 302.
সুন্দরী তুয়া দিঠি অখির সন্ধান—Vaishnavapadalahari.

We prefer the reading 'অখির সন্ধান' to 'অখিল সন্ধান' ।

- (d) কুমুম শরে জর জর—Padakalpataru and
C. U. MS. No. 302.
হুহু শরে জর জর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

We prefer the former version.

- (e) ঐছে তপত জনে গোপতে রাখবি তব—Padakalpataru.
ঐছে তপত জনে গুপতে রাখবি—Vaishnavapadalahari.
ঐছে তপত জনে গুপতে রাখু জনু—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (f) গোবিন্দদাস গুণ গায়—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.
গোবিন্দদাস বশ গায় ॥—C. U. MS. No. 302.

19. Different readings in regard to the song—তুয়া অপরূপ
রূপ হেরি দূর সঞে.....

- (a) বিভাষ—C. U. MS. No. 302.
কড়াখা—Vaishnavapadalahari, Padakalpataru and
Padāmritasamudra.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript.

(e) কহই না পারই—Padāmritasamudra, Padakalpataru
and Vaishnavapadalahari.

কহই না জানিয়ে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(f) কৈছে বিশোয়াসব বালা—Padakalpataru, Padalahari and
Padāmritasamudra.

কৈছে আশোয়াসব বালা—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কড়খা

তুয়া অপরূপ রূপ হেরি দূর সঞে
লোচন মন দুহুঁ ধাব ।

পরশক লাগি আগি জন্ম অন্তর
জীবন রহ কিয়ে যাব ॥

মাধব, তোহে কি শিখাওব ভঙ্গী ।
প্রেম অগেয়ান দহনে ধনী পৈঠলি
জন্ম তন্ম দহত পতঙ্গী ॥

কহত সমবাদ কহই না পারই
কৈছে আশোয়াসব বালা ।

অনুখন ধরনী শয়নে কত মেটব
সুতন্ম অতন্ম শর জালা ॥

মালিন্দী-কুল কদম্ব কানন
নামে নয়ানে ঝরু বারি ।

গোবিন্দদাস কহই অব মাধব
কৈসে জীয়াব বরনারী ॥

20. Different readings in regard to the song—কাঞ্চন
গোরী ভোরি বৃন্দাবনে.....

- (a) স্নহই—C. U. MS. No. 302.
ধানশী—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.
- (b) বিহরই সহচরী মেলি—C. U. MS. No. 302.
খেলই সহচরী মেলি—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
- (c) গরলে ভরল তনু—C. U. MS. No. 302.
গরলে তনু জারল—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
- (d) মরমহি গোই এদিন যামিনী—C. U. MS. No. 302.
মরমহি গোই রোই দিন যামিনী—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru.

- (e) অলখিতে বিরহ বেয়াধি—C. U. MS. No. 302.
অলখিত বিষম বিয়াধি—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
- (f) গুরুজন অবুধ মুগধ পতি পরিজন
—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.
অবুধ পতি পরিজন গৃহে গুরু দুর্জন
—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (g) গোবিন্দদাস কিয়ে জানি—Padāmritasamudra.
গোবিন্দদাস কহে মানি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

21. Different readings in regard to the song—কুবলয় নীল
রতন দলিতাঞ্জন...

(a) বেলোয়ার—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.
ধানত্রী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(b) অলকা তিলকা ললিতানন চাঁদ—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.
অলকা তিলকা ললিতাঞ্জন চাঁদ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru. The expression ‘ললিতাঞ্জন চাঁদ’ conveys no idea.

(c) আয়ত রে নব নাগর কান—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.
আয়ত রে মম নাগর কান—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(d) ভাঙ বিভঙ্গিম কুটিল নেহারই—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
ভাঙু ভঙ্গিম তহি কুটিল নেহারই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(e) গজমতি ভাতি গমন অতি মম্বর—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.
গজবর গতি জিতি গমন হুম্বর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University MS. Of course the version of the Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru can be explained like this—“the gem ‘গজমতি’ was shining and his movements were graceful.” But it does not seem quite happy. We get a more happy and suggestive expression in the version—“গজবর গতি জিতি গমন হুম্বর”। “His movements were more graceful than those of the prince of elephants.”

(b) জয় জয় জগজন লোচন-কাঁদ—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

জয় জয় জগমন মোহন কাঁদ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(c) আজানু ললিত—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.
আজানু বিলম্বিত—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(d) বিশ্বাধর পর মোহন মুরলী—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

সুভগ অধর পর সুমোহন মুরলী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions the latter, *i.e.*, that of the University MS. seems more perfect in rhythm.

Let us now give the whole song as it stands after all these additions and alterations.

শ্রীরাগ

অভিনব নীল জলদ তনু ঢর ঢর

পুচ্ছ মুকুট শিরে সাজনি রে ।

কাঞ্চন বসন রতনময় আভরণ

নূপুর রণু ঝুণু বাজনি রে ॥

জয় জয় জগজন লোচন কাঁদ ।

রাধারমণ বৃন্দাবন চাঁদ ॥

ইন্দীবর যুগ লোচন সুভগ

চঞ্চল অঞ্চল কুসুম শরে ।

অবিচল কুল রমণীগণ-মানস

জর জর অন্তর প্রেম ভরে ॥

বনি বনমালা আজানু বিলম্বিত

পরিমলে অলিকুল মাতি রহ' ।

সুভগ অধর পর সুমোহন মুরলী

গায়ত গোবিন্দদাস পছ' ॥

23. Different readings in regard to the song—অঞ্জন গঞ্জন
জগজ্জন রঞ্জন.....

- (a) সিদ্ধুড়া—Padakalpataru and C. U. MS. No. 302.
বেলোয়ার—Vaishnavapadalahari.
- (b) চাঁদ মলিন ভেল লাজে—Padakalpataru and
C. U. MS. No. 302.
হেরি হেরি চাঁদ মলিন ভেল লাজে—Vaishnavapadalahari.
- (c) ইন্দীবরক গরব বিমোচন—Vaishnavapadalahari.
ইন্দীবর বর গরব বিমোচন—Padāmritasamudra,
Padakalpataru and C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer the latter version.
It is more perfect in rhythm.

- (d) জলদ পুঞ্জ জিনি বরণা—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.
মেঘ পুঞ্জ জিনি বরণা—Padāmritasamudra.
সুনীল মেঘ জিনি বরণা—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (e) লোচন মনোরথ কাঁদ—Padakalpataru.
লোচন মনমথ কাঁদ—C. U. MS. No. 302 and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
লোচন মনসিজ ফান্দ—Padāmritasamudra.

The version of the Padakalpataru is faulty. The expression 'মনোরথ' is quite meaningless here. The other two versions are equally acceptable.

The entire song, as it stands after all these additions and alterations, is given below.

সিন্ধুড়া

অঞ্জন গঞ্জন জগজন রঞ্জন
 জলদ পুঞ্জ জিনি বরণা ।
 তরুণারুণ থল কমল দলারুণ
 মঞ্জীর রঞ্জিত চরণা ॥
 দেখে সখিনাগররাজ বিরাজে ।
 সুধই সুধারস হাস বিকাশিত
 চাঁদ মলিন ভেল লাজে ॥
 ইন্দীবর বর গরব বিমোচন
 লোচন মনমথ ফাঁদে ।
 ভাঙ ভুজগ পাশে বাঁধল কুলবতী
 কুল দেবতা মন কাঁদে ॥
 ভ্রমর করস্থিত আজানু লম্বিত
 কেলি কদম্বক মাল ।
 গোবিন্দদাস চিতে নিতি নিতি বিহরত
 ঐছন মুরতি রসাল ॥

24. Different readings in regard to the song—সহচরী মেলি
 চলল বররঙ্গিনী.....

(a) চলল বররঙ্গিনী—Vaishnavapadalahari.

চলল যব রঙ্গিনী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(b) কাঞ্চন শিরীষ কুসুম জিনি তনুরুচি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

কনক শিরীষ কুসুম জমু তনুরুচি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (c) সো ধনী চিত-চকোর—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

শুন সজনি সো ধনী চিতক চোর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Both the above versions are quite sensible, but we prefer that of the University Manuscript. The expression 'চিত-চকোর' by itself is quite all right, but it is not very happy in connection with the idea expressed in the next line—চোরিক পন্থ ভোরি দরশায়লি চঞ্চল নয়নক ওর ॥

- (d) শূন হৃদয় অবমান—Vaishnavapadalahari.
শূন হৃদয় অবমানি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (e) মনমথ পাপ দহনে তনু জারত—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.
মনমথ তাপ দহনে তনু জারত—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Let us now give the whole song as it stands after all these additions and alterations.

বরাড়ী

সহচরী মেলি চল বর রঙ্গিনী,
কালিন্দী করই সিনান ।
কাঞ্চন শিরীষ কুসুম জিনি তনুরুচি
দিনকর-কিরণে মৈলান ॥
সজনি, সো ধনী চিতক চোর ।
চোরিক পন্থ ভোরি দরশায়ল
চঞ্চল নয়নক ওর ॥

কোমল চরণ চলত অতি মন্দর
 উতপত বালুক বেল ।
 হেরইতে হামারি সজল দিঠি পঙ্কজে,
 দুহুঁ পাতুক করি নেল ॥
 চিত নয়ন মঝু এ দুহুঁ চোরায়লি,
 শূন হৃদয় অবমান ।
 মনমথ পাপ দহনে তনু জারত,
 গোবিন্দদাস ভালে জান ॥

25. Different readings in regard to the song—হেরইতে
 হেরি না হেরি.....

(a) স্নুহই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

বালা ধানশী—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapada-
 lahari.

(b) পুছইতে কেহই না কহে পুন বেরি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

পুছইতে কহই না কহে পুন বেরি—C. U. MS. No. 302

and Padakalpataru.

We prefer the version of the Manuscript. The expression 'না কহে পুন বেরি' means—'she did not speak again.' So it is clear that Rādhā spoke once before it. Otherwise the expression 'she did not speak again' has got no significance here. Thus the version of the University MS. 'পুছইতে কহই না কহে পুন বেরি'—'Sometimes she replies, sometimes she remains silent,' seems quite all right. The idea contained in this version is quite in keeping with the idea expressed in the preceding line—'হেরইতে হেরি না হেরি.' The version—'পুছইতে কেহই না কহে পুন বেরি' is faulty.

- (c) রস পরিহাসে হসই না হসই—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

রস পরিহাস সহই না সহই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Both the ideas are equally happy and suggestive.

- (d) তরুণী না শৈশব বুঝই না পারি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

তরুণিম শৈশব লেখই না পারি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

তরুণিম শৈশব লখই না পারি—Padakalpataru.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the University manuscript. The versions of the Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari are both faulty. The expression 'তরুণিম শৈশব' is quite unintelligible. The version—'তরুণী না শৈশব বুঝই না পারি' is quite clear in its expression. Krishna says—"I cannot understand, whether she is a grown up girl or she is still a mere child."

- (e) হঠ সঞে—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

হঠসে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (f) তবহিঁ কুসুম শরে জোরি—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

তবহু কুসুম শরে ভোরি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (g) ছুটল বাণ ফুটল হিয়ে মোরি—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

ছুটল বাণ ফুটল মোরি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Now let us quote the whole song after all these additions and alterations.

বালা ধানশী

হেরইতে হেরি না হেরি ।

পুছইতে কহই না কহে পুণ বেরি ॥

চতুর সখী সঙ্গে বসই ।
 রস পরিহাসে হাসই না হাসই ॥
 পেখনু ব্রজ নরনারী ।
 তরুণী না শৈশব লখই না পারি ॥
 হৃদয় নয়ন গতি রীতে ।
 সো কিয়ে আন নহত পরতীতে ॥
 ঐছন হেরইতে গোরা ।
 হঠ সঞে পৈঠল মন মাহা মোরি ॥
 গোবিন্দদাস চিতে জাগ ।
 চাঁদক লাগি সূরষ উপরাগ ॥

26. Different readings in regard to the song—রতন মন্দিরে
বৈঠল বর সুন্দরী.....

(a) রতন মন্দির মাহা সব সুন্দরী—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

রতন মন্দিরে বৈঠল বর সুন্দরী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the
University MS. It is more perfect in rhythm.

(b) সখী সহ রস পরচার—Vaishnavapadalahari.

সখী সঞে রস পরচার—Padakalpataru.

সখী সঙ্গে রস পরখাই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(c) ভরম ভরে সুন্দরী—Vaishnavapadalahari.

ভরম ভরে ভামিনী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the
Vaishnavapadalahari. We cannot accept the reading—“ভরম

ভরে ভামিনী,” which gives us a defective rhyme. The preceding line ends with the word ‘হেরি,’ which cannot be rhymed with ‘ভামিনী.’

(d) বাঁপই বাঁপল দেহা—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

বাঁপই কাঞ্চন দেহা—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Both the versions are quite sensible. But the version—
“বাঁপই বাঁপল দেহা” seems more suggestive. The word ‘বাঁপই’ here means ‘with all haste.’

(e) মোড়ি তনু সুন্দরী—Vaishnavapadalahari.

মোড়ি তনু বল্লভী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

We cannot accept the version of the University MS. The word ‘বল্লভী,’ with which the line ‘মোড়ি তনু বল্লভী,’ ends itself, cannot at all be rhymed with the word ‘হেরি,’ the last word of the preceding line. Such a defect in rhyme is impossible to occur in the poem of Govindadās, who is a pastmaster of rhyme and rhythm.

(f) মোহে হেরি সখী করু কোর—Vaishnavapadalahari.

মোহে হরে সখী করু কোর—Padakalpataru.

মোহে বিসখী করু কোর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari.

The entire song, as it stands now, is given below :—

সুহই

রতন মন্দিরে

বৈঠল বর সুন্দরী

সখী সহ রস পরচার ।

হসইতে খসয়ে

কত যে মণি মোতিম

দশন কিরণ অবছার ॥

শুন সজনি, কহইতে না রহে লাজ ।
 সো বরনারী হামারি মন বারণ
 বাঁধল কুচগিরি মাঝ ॥
 মঝু মুখ হেরি ভরম ভরে স্তন্দরী
 ঝাঁপই ঝাঁপল দেহা ।
 কুটিল কটাক্ষ বিশিখে তনু জর জর
 জীবনে না বাঁধই গেহা ॥
 করে কর জোড়ি মোড়ি তনু স্তন্দরী
 মোহে হেরি সখী করু কোর ।
 গোবিন্দদাস ভণ তেঞি নন্দ-নন্দন
 দোলত মদন হিলোর ॥

27. Different readings in regard to the song—নিরমল বদন
কমল বর মাধুরী.....

- (a) ধানশ্রী—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.
 সুহই—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (b) অকূলে কূল নাহি পাই—C. U. MS. No. 302.
 আকূল নাহি পাই—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 আকূল কূল নাহি পাই—Padakalpataru.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the University MS. The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari is altogether meaningless. The other version (that of the Padakalpataru) is sensible but not very happy.

- (c) মরমক বেদন মরমহি জানত
 সদয় হৃদয় তহি যাই ।—Vaishnavapadalahari.

মরমক বেদন

মরম নাহি জানত

সদয় হৃদয় তহি চাই ।—C. U. MS. No. 302.

মরমক বেদন

মরমহি জানত

সদয় হৃদয় তহি চাই ।—Padakalpataru.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru. The version of the University MS. is also quite sensible. But we think the expression ‘মরমহি জানত’ is more suggestive than ‘মরম নাহি জানত.’ The version of the Vaishnavapadalāharī is altogether faulty. The expression ‘সদয় হৃদয় তহি যাই,’ is quite meaningless. It should be ‘সদয় হৃদয় তহি চাই ।’—‘I want your sympathy.’

(d) গোবিন্দদাস কহ

নিতি নিতি নৌতুন

লাগল রসবতী রাই ।—Vaishnavapadalāharī.

গোবিন্দদাস কহ

নিতি নব নৌতুন

মনে লাগল রসবতী রাই ॥—Padakalpataru.

গোবিন্দদাস পছকে

নিহনি নৌতুন

চিতে লাগল রসবতী রাই ॥—C. U. MS. No. 302.

All the above three versions are quite sensible. But the version of the University MS. seems more poetic and suggestive. In the other two versions the poet Govindadās says—“Rādhā was ever-new to Krishna.” This is quite sensible, but not so suggestive and poetic as the version of the University MS. which says—“The sweet Rādhā has touched the heart of Krishna, the master of Govindadās, who for the first time experiences the approach of love.”

The whole song stands thus after going through all these tests :

ধানশ্রী

নিরমল বদন কমলবর মাধুরী
 হেরইতে ভৈ গেনু ভোর ।
 অলখিতে রঙ্গিণী ভাঙ ভুজঙ্গিণী
 মরমহি দংশল মোর ॥
 হরি হরি যব ধরি পেখশু রাই ।
 মদন মহোদধি নিমগন মঝুমন
 অকূলে কুল নাহি পাই ॥
 বঙ্কম হাসি বিলোকন অঞ্চলে
 মঝুপর যো দিঠি দেল ।
 কিয়ে অনুরাগিণী কিয়ে বিরাগিণী
 বুঝইতে সংশয় ভেল ॥
 মরমক বেদন মরমহি জানত
 সদয় হৃদয় তহি চাই ।
 গোবিন্দদাস পহকে নিছনি নৌতুন
 চিতে লাগল রসবতী রাই ॥

28. Different readings in regard to the song—কাঞ্চন
কমল পবনে উলটায়ল.....

(a) কামোদ—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.
গান্ধার—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(b) হরি হরি কো দেই দারুণ বাধা—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.
শুন সজনি কো দেই দারুণ বাধা—C. U. MS. No. 302.

হরি হরি কো দেই দারুণ বাধা ।
 নয়নক সাধ আধ না পূরল
 পালটি না হেরিনু রাধা ॥
 ঘন ঘন আঁচর কুচ কনকাচল
 ঝাঁপই হাসি হাসি হেরি ।
 জলু মঝু মন হরি কনয়া কুস্ত ভরি
 মছরি রাখত কত বেরি ।
 যব মন বাঁধল ইন্দ্রিয় কাঁপর
 তাহি বিহনে আগেরান ।
 কাঠক মুরতি ঐছে মুরছায়ত
 গোবিন্দদাস পরমাণ ॥

29. Different readings in regard to the song—ঝাঁহা ঝাঁহা
 নিকশই তনু তনু জ্যোতি.....

(a) তথা রাগ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

বালা ধানশী—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

(b) ঝাঁহা ঝাঁহা নিকশয়ে তনু তনু জ্যোতি—Vaishnavapadalahari
 and Padakalpataru.

ঝাঁহা ঝাঁহা নিকশই বর তনু জ্যোতি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari, which is identical with the version of the Padakalpataru. The version of the University MS. is also quite sensible, but lacks the music, vibrating in the other version.

- (c) বিজুরি চমকয় হোতি—Vaishnavapadalāharī and
Padakalpataru.

বিজুরি চমকে মতি হোতি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Both the versions are quite sensible. But we prefer the version of the University MS. It is more rich in music and alliteration, for which the poet Govindadās is so famous among the Vaishnava poets. The expression ‘মতি হোতি’ means (মনে হয়) it appears in the mind.

- (d) হামারি জীবন সঙ্গে করতহি খেলি—Vaishnavapadalāharī
and Padakalpataru.

হামারি মরম সঙ্গে করত কত খেলি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (e) কালিন্দী হিলোল—Vaishnavapadalāharī and
Padakalpataru.

কালিন্দী কলোল—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (f) যাঁহা যাঁহা তরল বিলোকন পড়ই—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalāharī.

যাঁহা যাঁহা বিলোল বিলোচন পড়ই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (g) তাঁহা তাঁহা নীল উতপল বন ভরই—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalāharī.

তাঁহা তাঁহা থির উতপল দল ভরই—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru, which is identical with the version of the Vaishnavapadalāharī. The immediate preceding line is “যাঁহা যাঁহা তরল বিলোচন পড়ই,” “wherever she casts her sweet glances.” So the expression—“নীল উতপল,” “blue lotuses” is quite expressive here, suggesting the blue eyes of Rādhā.

The song stands thus after all these additions and alterations :

বালা ধানশী

যাঁহা যাঁহা নিকশয়ে তনু তনু জ্যোতি ।
 তাঁহা তাঁহা বিজুরী চমকে মতি হোতি ॥
 যাঁহা যাঁহা অরুণ চরণে চল চলই ।
 তাঁহা তাঁহা খল কমলদল খলই ॥
 দেখে সখি কো ধনী সহচরী মেলি ।
 আমারি জীবন সঞে করতহি খেলি ॥

30. Different readings in regards to the song—মদন কিরাত
 কুসুম শরে জর জর

(a) শ্রীরাগ—Padakalpataru and Vaishnavapadalahari.

শ্রীগন্ধার—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(b) মদন কিরাত

কুসুম শরে জর জর

বৃন্দাবন বন মাঝে ।—Padakalpataru and

Vaishnavapadalahari.

মদন কিরাত

কুসুম শর দারুণ

শীতল বৃন্দাবন মাঝে ।—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(c) সুন্দরি তুয়া দিঠি অখিল সন্ধানে—Padakalpataru.

এ ধনি তুয়া দিঠি অখির সন্ধানে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

সুন্দরি তুয়া দিঠি অখির সন্ধানে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

The versions of the University MS. and Vaishnavapadalahari, which are almost identical, seem more expressive

than the version of the Padakalpataru. The expression 'অথির সন্ধান' is more suggestive than 'অখিল সন্ধান.'

- (d) ঐছে তপত জনে গুপতে রাখতি—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 ঐছে তপত জনে গোপতে রাখবি যব—Padakalpataru.
 ঐছে তপত জনে গুপতে রাখু জমু—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (e) গুণ গায়—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.
 যশ গায়—C. U. MS. No. 302.

- (f) দুহু শরে জর জর জীবন অন্তর
 কিয়ে করব নাহি জানি।—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahari.

কুসুম শরে জর জর জীবন অন্তর
 কিয়ে করব নাহি জানি।—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of these two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru, which is identical with the version of the Vaishnavapadalahari. The expression 'দুহু শরে জর জর' is more significant here than the expression 'কুসুম শরে জর জর.' For in the preceding line we get description of the two beautiful eyes of Rādhā, which have been compared to a pair of arrows.

- (g) নিজ যশ চাই রাই অব দেয়বি
 অধর সুধারস পান।—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahari.

নিজ যশ রাই আপন হি রাখউ
 অধর সুধা রস দানে।—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Both the above versions are equally sensible and acceptable.

Now let us quote the entire song after all these additions and alterations have been made.

শ্রীরাগ

মদন কিরাত কুমুম শর দারুণ

বৃন্দাবন বন মাঝ ।

তাহি আকুল হরি তোহারি শরণ করি

পরিহরি পৌরুষ লাজ ॥

সুন্দরি, তুয়া দিঠি আখির সঙ্কানে ।

মনমথ মারিতে জোড়ি নয়ন শর

হানলি হামারি পরাণে ॥

দুহু শরে জর জর জীবন অন্তর

কিয়ে করব নাহি জান ।

নিজ বশ চাই রাই অব দেয়বি

অধর সুধারস পান ॥

মণিময় হার তরঙ্গিনী তীরহি

কুচ কনকচল ছায় ।

ঐছে তপত জনে গুপতে রাখবি

গোবিন্দদাস গুণ গায় ॥

— — — — —

31. Different readings in regard to the song—কনক লতা
কিয়ে বিকশল পদ্মিনী.....

- (a) কনক লতা কিয়ে কিশলয় পদ্মিনী—Vaishnavapadalahari.
কনক লতা কিয়ে বিকশিল পদ্মিনী—Padakalpataru.
কনক লতায় বিফল পদ্মিনী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The version of the University MS. is absolutely meaningless. The other two versions are both sensible.

- (b) কিয়ে মহী বিজুরী উজোর—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
মহী জন্ম বিজুরী উজোর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Both the versions give us the same idea.

- (c) হেরইতে ভৈ গেনু ভোর—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.
হেরইতে আয়লু ভোর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The version of the University manuscript cannot be accepted. The expression ‘আয়লু ভোর’ carries no sense at all.

- (d) অলখিতে হানলি চিতে—C. U. MS. No. 302.
হানলি অন্তর চিতে—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University MS.

- (e) কতি খনে ধরবি পরাণ—Padakalpataru and
C. U. MS. No. 302.
অতি খনে ধরবি পরাণ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

The expression ‘অতি খণে’ is absolutely meaningless here. It should be ‘কতি খনে.’ The idea is—“how long can a man live (after being pierced by the arrows of her ravishing side-glances).” Thus ‘কতিখণে’ (how long) is quite suggestive here.

- (f) বিঘটন সময়—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
বিঘন সময়—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Let us now give the entire song after all these additions and alterations have been made.

শ্রীরাগ

কনক লতা কিয়ে কিশলয় পতুমিনী
 কিয়ে মহী বিজুরী উজোর ।
 কুঞ্জ কুটীরে কিয়ে উজল হিমকর
 হেরইতে ভৈ গেনু ভোর ॥
 সুন্দরি তোহারি চরিত বিপরীতে ।
 কাজর গরলহি ভরল নয়ন শর
 অলখিতে হানলি চিতে ॥
 তব অগেয়ান করলি তুহু* ঐছন
 অব সুপুরুষ বধ জান ।
 উচ কুচ পাথর সরস পরশ দেই
 উদঘাটাই দিঠিবাণ ॥
 আশ পাশ হাস হাস দরশায়লি
 কতি খনে ধরবি পরাণ ।
 বিষটন সময় পালটি নাহি আয়ত
 গোবিন্দদাস পরমাণ ॥

32. Different readings in regard to the song—তুয়া
 অপরূপ রূপ হেরি দূর সঞে.....

(a) বিভাস—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কড়খা—Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru.

(b) তুয়া অপরূপ রূপ হেরি দূর সঞে

লোচন মন দুহু* খাব ।—Padakalpataru,

Vaishnavapadalahari and Padāmritasamudra.

তুয়া অপরূপ রূপ হেরি দরশয়ে

চিত নয়ন ছল্ ধাব।—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Both the versions are equally acceptable.

(c) পরশক লাগি

যনু অন্তর

জীবন রহ কিয়ে যাব।—Padāmritasamudra.

পরশক লাগি

আগি জনু অন্তর

জীবন রহ কিয়ে যাব।—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalaharī.

পরশক লাগি

অথির অন্তর

জীবন রহব কিয়ে যাব।—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Padakalpa aru, which is identical with the version of the Vaishnavapadalaharī. The version of the Padāmritasamudra is defective from the standpoint of rhythm. The version of the University gives us quite a sensible reading. But the version of the Padakalpataru is more happy in its expression. Moreover the alliteration of 'লাগি' with 'আগি' is typical of the poet Govindadās. But I think the line 'জীবন রহব কিয়ে যাব'—is more perfect in rhythm than the reading—"জীবন রহ কিয়ে যাব."

(d) মাধব তোহে কি কহব করি ভঙ্গি—Padakalpataru and
Padāmritasamudra.

শুন মাধব, তোহে কি শিখাওব ভঙ্গি—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(e) কহই না পারই—Padāmritasamudra, Padakalpataru
and Vaishnavapadalaharī.

কহই না জানিয়ে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(f) কৈহে বিশোয়াসব বালা—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalaharī.

কাহে বিশোয়াসব বালা—Padāmritasamudra.

কৈছে আশোয়াসব বালা—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(g) অতনু শর জ্বালা—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

অতনু সম জ্বালা—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru, which is identical with the version of the Vaishnavapadalahari. The expression 'অতনু সম জ্বালা' is not at all happy. The word 'অতনু' means 'Madana' the god of love. Thus the expression 'অতনু শর জ্বালা' is quite clear in its idea. It means the pangs of the arrows of Cupid.

Now let us quote the whole song as it stands after these additions and alterations :

কড়াধা

তুয়া অপরূপ রূপ হেরি দূর সঞে

লোচন মন দুহুঁ ধাব ।

পরশক লাগি আগি জনু অন্তর

জীবন রহব কিয়ে যাব ॥

মাধব তোহে কি শিখাওব ভঙ্গী ।

প্রেম অগেয়ান দহনে ধনী পৈঠলি

জনু তনু দহত পতঙ্গী ॥

কহত সমবাদ কহই না পারই

কৈহে আশোয়াসব বালা ।

অনুখণ ধরগী শয়নে কত মেটব

সুতনু অতনু শর জ্বালা ॥

কালিন্দী মূল কদম্ব কানন নামে

নয়ানে অঝরু ঝরু বারি ।

গোবিন্দদাস কহই অব মাধব

কৈসে জীবব বরনারী ॥

33. Different readings in regard to the song—*নন্দনন্দন*
নব ঘনশ্যাম.....

(a) ধানশী—C. U. MS. No. 302.

তুড়ী—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

(b) রাধারমণ রমণী-মনমোহন—Vaishnavapadalaharī and
Padakalpataru.

রাধারমণ রমণী-মোহন—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(c) নাগরীগণ সেব—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

নাগরীগণ কৃত সেব—C. U. MS. No. 302.

নাগরীগণ কত সেব—Padakalpataru.

(d) নন্দন নবঘনশ্যাম—Vaishnavapadalaharī and
Padakalpataru.

নন্দনন্দন নবঘনশ্যাম—C. U. MS. No. 302.

The version of the MS. is not in keeping with the regular rhythm of the song. So we prefer the other version.

(e) মুখরিত মোহন বংশ—Vaishnavapadalaharī and
Padakalpataru.

মুখরিত মধুরিম বংশ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(f) সুবলসখা সুন্দর—Vaishnavapadalaharī and
Padakalpataru.

সুবল সুখ সুন্দর—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(g) চন্দন চারু অবতংস—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

চন্দন চারু শ্রবণ অবতংস—C. U. MS. No. 302.

সুন্দর চারুতংস—Padakalpataru.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalaharī. The University MS. gives us almost the same version, with the additional word 'শ্রবণ' put before

‘অবতংস.’ But we think, the word ‘শ্রবণ’ is quite redundant here, for the word ‘অবতংস’ means ornaments for ears.

- (h) কালিয় দমন গমন কুঞ্জর—Vaishnavapadalahari.
কালিয় দমন গমন জিতি কুঞ্জর—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (i) কুঞ্জর জিতি রতিরঙ্গ—Vaishnavapadalahari.
কুঞ্জর জিনি গতিভঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Now let us quote the whole song as it stands after all these additions and alterations :

ধানশী ।

রাধারমণ রমণী মনমোহন

বৃন্দাবন বনদেব ।

অভিনব রাস রসিক বর নাগর

নাগরীগণ সেব ॥

ব্রজপতি দম্পতি হৃদয় আনন্দন

নন্দন নবঘনশ্যাম ।

নন্দীশ্বর পুর পুরট পটাস্বর

রামানুজ গুণধাম ॥

গোবর্দ্ধন ধর ধরণী সুধাকর

মুখরিত মোহন বংশ ।

দাম সুদাম সুবল সখা সুন্দর

চন্দন চারু অবতংস ॥

কালিয় দমন গমন কুঞ্জর

কুঞ্জর জিতি রতিরঙ্গ ।

গোবিন্দদাস হৃদয় মণিমন্দির

অবিচল মুরতি ত্রিভঙ্গ ॥

34. Different readings in regard to the song—কুটিল কুন্তল
কুসুম কাছনি.....

(a) বরাড়ি—Padakalpataru.

মল্লার—C. U. MS. No. 302 and Vaishnavapadalahari.

(b) কুসুম কাঁচলি—Padakalpataru.

কুসুম কাছনি—Vaishnavapadalahari and

C. U. MS. No. 302.

(c) কুন্দকোরক হাস—Padakalpataru.

কুণ্ডকোরক হাস রে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

কুন্দ কৈরব হাস রে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above three versions, we prefer that of the University Manuscript.

The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari is faulty.

The expression ‘কুণ্ডকোরক’ carries no sense at all. The version of the Padakalpataru is quite sensible; but the version of the University manuscript seems to be more suggestive.

In the version of the Padakalpataru Krishna's sweet smile has been compared with the whiteness of a Kunda flower in its budding stage. The Kunda flower is famous for its whiteness, and our Indian poets are very fond of comparing one's smile with its whiteness. Thus there is nothing to complain here. But the version of the manuscript gives us a reading more artistic and expressive. The version of the manuscript is—“কুন্দ কৈরব হাস রে।” The word “কুন্দ” signifies ‘whiteness’ and the word “কৈরব” means—‘moonbeam.’ Thus both the words give us the idea of purity and whiteness. To compare one's sweet smile with the cool and soothing silvery moonbeam is certainly more artistic and expressive than comparing it with the whiteness of a particular flower.

(d) কান্তিকুবলয় ভাস রে—Vaishnavapadalahari and

Padakalpataru.

কান্তিকুবলয় ভাস—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru.

Here the word কান্তি means colour, the word কুবলয় means a blue lotus, and the word ভাস is the abbreviation of the word অভাস which literally means 'suggestion.' Thus the whole sentence would mean—his (Krishna's) colour (suggested) resembled the colour of a blue lotus.

The version of the Manuscript is faulty. The word কান্ত means beautiful. Thus the whole sentence would mean—"Beautiful and resembling a blue lotus." This is all right, but then, where is the nominative in the sentence? Thus we can reject this version altogether.

(e) কান্ত কালিন্দীকূল কাননে

কুঞ্জ কুঞ্জর রাজ—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কালিন্দীকূল কদম্ব কাননে

কুঞ্জ কুঞ্জরাজ রে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

কামু কালিন্দী কূলকাননে

কুঞ্জ কুঞ্জর রাজ—Padakalpataru.

Of the above three versions, we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalahari. The version of the Manuscript and Padakalpataru are defective in rhythm. Such a defect in rhythm one cannot expect in the writings of a poet like Govindadāsa, whose perfection in rhythm is proverbial.

(f) কামিনী কুঙ্কমাঙ্কিত—C. U. MS. No. 302.

কামিনী কুচকুঙ্কমাঙ্কিত—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(g) কুণ্ডলাকৃতি অংস রে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

কুণ্ডলাঙ্কিত অংস রে—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the University Manuscript.

The word অংস means shoulder, and the expression কুণ্ডলাকৃতি means having the shape of a কুণ্ডল, a kind of ornament for

the ear. It may also mean an ornament for the neck. Now to compare the shoulder of Krishna with an ornament is quite absurd, so we cannot accept this version.

The version of the University MS. gives us quite a sensible reading. The word কুণ্ডল, as we have already said, may mean an ornament for the neck, so the expression 'কুণ্ডলাঙ্কিত অংস' is quite sensible. The word অঙ্কিত means 'adorned with.' Thus the whole sentence would mean—"the neck of Krishna was adorned with a necklace."

(h)	কেকী কোকিল	কণ্ঠ কণ্ঠক
	কাকলীকৃত বংশ রে—Vaishnavapadalahari.	
	কেলী কোকিল	কণ্ঠ কুণ্ঠক
	কাকলীকৃত বংশ রে—Padakalpataru.	
	কেলী কোকিল	কণ্ঠ কণ্ঠক
	কাকলীকৃত বংশ রে—C. U. MS. No. 302.	

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru. Of course the version of the manuscript is equally sensible and gives us exactly the same idea. But the version of the Padakalpataru seems more suggestive and expressive.

The version of the Vaishnavapadalahari cannot be accepted. The poet means to say that the sweet and melodious sound of Krishna's flute surpassed even the songs of cuckoos and peahens in sweetness. The bird cuckoo (কোকিল) is famous for its sweet voice, but how can (কেকী) a peahen's voice be taken into account here? We think, it should be 'কেলী কোকিল' (a cuckoo in its amorous mood) instead of 'কেকী কোকিল' (peahens and cuckoos).

Of the two expressions কণ্ঠ কণ্ঠক and কণ্ঠ কুণ্ঠক, we prefer the latter. Both the expressions are quite sensible and carries the same idea. But the expression কণ্ঠ কুণ্ঠক seems more expressive and suggestive.

the Vaishnavapadalahari, etc. They are not even incorporated in the Aprakāśita Padaratnāvalī, a collection of unpublished Vaishnava songs, edited by the late Mr. Satishchandra Ray, M.A. and published by the Baṅgiya Sahitya Parishad.


1.

তথারাগ ।

অলস তেজ উঠত যদুরায় ।
 আগত ভানু রজনী চলি যায় ॥
 প্রাতহি দোহন করত যদুচান্দ ।
 তুরিতহি দেয়ল দোহন ছান্দ ॥
 নজন উপেখি চলল বরকান ।
 নূপুরের নাদে জাগয়ে পাঁচবাণ ॥
 নিকটহি গোষ্ঠ মিলল যদুরায় ।
 গোবিন্দদাস মটকি লই ধায় ॥

বেলাবরি ।

প্রাতহি কুঞ্জে কয়ল পয়ান ।
 গোধন দোহন করতহি কান ॥
 সুন্দর অরুণ শ্যামরু চন্দ ।
 দোহন ধেনু করত বহু ছন্দ ॥
 দোহন গরজত শবদ গভীর ।
 ন ঘন দোহন করত যদুবীর ॥
 গোরস ধার চুয়ায়ত অঙ্গ ।
 তমালে বেটল যেন মোতিম রঙ্গ ॥
 মটকি মটকি ভরি রাখত ঢারি ।
 গোবিন্দদাস কহে যাঙ বলিহারি ॥



A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE SONGS OF GOVINDADĀSA

By

BISWAPATI CHAUDHURI, M.A.

The main sources whence the Vaishnava padas have come down to us are the standard anthologies, old manuscripts and the songs of the Kīrtanīyās, who have made it their profession to sing the *padas*. But all these sources do not always agree as to the readings of the songs.

The editors of these anthologies generally collected the songs from different manuscripts, and the owners of these manuscripts, in their turn, collected the songs from the Kīrtanīyās. Some of these men were not very literate, so they frequently committed errors. The Vaishnava songs were written generally by men of high culture and education, and their *padas* were, in most cases, written in a language, full of lyrical subtleties and fine ideas. How can one expect the illiterate Kīrtanīyās of the countryside to do full justice to the texts while reproducing them before the public.

The manuscript-writers had to copy the songs from the verbal reproduction of these Kīrtanīyās, who were not at all reliable. Thus a song taken from the lips of one Kīrtanīyā would differ in reading from the same song reproduced by another Kīrtanīyā. This is why the manuscripts differ so much in their readings, and this is why the anthologies based on these manuscripts differ so much with one another.

These are the difficulties we are to face in giving the correct readings of a Vaishnava song. In order that textual

inaccuracies may be avoided, as far as possible, and the pristine beauty of the poems may be preserved intact, we have in this quarterly report examined all the available editions of Govindadāsa and the printed anthologies of Vaishnava songs with the help of the old manuscripts lying in the libraries of the Calcutta University, the Sāhitya Parishad of Calcutta and other literary institutions.

In this report I have compared different readings in regard to as many as 13 songs of Govindadāsa, giving my reasons, as far as possible, for preferring one version of a song to another. In doing this I have compared as many manuscripts as have been available to me.

1. Different readings in regard to the song—শুন শুন শুন
সুজন কানাই তুমি সে নূতন দানী.....

(a) (ক) একি বিকি কিনির ধন—Padakalpataru
(Parishad and Baṭṭalā).

(খ) একি বিকির ধন—Vaishnavapadalahaṛī and
C. U. MS. No. 305.

(b) (ক) নারীর বেশন—Vaishnavapadalahaṛī and
C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) নারীর ভূষণ—Parishad MS. No. 953.

(গ) নারীর অঙ্গে অভরণ—C. U. MS. No. 304.

(ঘ) নারীর যৌবন—Padakalpataru (Parishad and
Baṭṭalā).

Of the above four versions we prefer the versions (ক) and (খ). The version (গ) is defective in rhythm. The version (ঘ) is not in keeping with the spirit of the song. In this song Krishna is found claiming the ornaments of Rādhā in exchange of his service as a boat-man. Krishna has not yet so much advanced in his acquaintance with Rādhā, as to claim her youth. So here the expression—একি বিকি-

কিনির ধন নারীর যৌবন—is a premature idea. In this song Rādhā is represented as always complaining that Krishna wanted her ornaments. And actually Krishna has been found nowhere, in this song, to claim any part of her (Rādhā's) body. So it seems quite unnatural for Rādhā to speak in this way.

- (c) (ক) মণিময় অভরণ সুরঙ্গ সাড়ি—C. U. MS. No. 305
and Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā).
(খ) মণি অভরণ সুরঙ্গ শাড়ী—Vaishnavapadalāharī,
Padakalpataru (Parishad) and C. U. MS. No. 304.

Of the above two versions, we prefer the version (খ). The version (ক) is not correct in rhythm. For these defects in rhythm, one might argue, the poet himself is to blame. The poet himself committed blunders and the commentator cannot be justified in rejecting them simply because they are anomalous. The reply to this objection is, that had it been any other poet of inferior order, such arguments might be advanced. But Govindadāsa was a finished master of his art. He was not only a great Sanskrit scholar but had a very fine ear for rhythm.

- (d) (ক) সুরঙ্গ শাড়ী—Vaishavapadalāharī, Padakalpataru,
and C. U. MSS. No. 304 305.
(খ) শ্রবণে কুণ্ডল—C. U. MS. No. 324.
(e) (ক) যদি কেবা নাহি পরে—C. U. MS. No. 304 and
Vaishnavapadalāharī.
(খ) জাদ কেবা নাহি পরে—C. U. MS. No. 305 and
Padakalpataru (Parishad).
(গ) কেবা নাহি পরে তাহা—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā).

Of the above three versions we can reject the version (ক). There is no significance of the word 'যদি' here. It should be 'জাদ' (বেগীতে বুলাইবার খোপা).

- (f) (ক) যদি দানের এ গতি—Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).
 (খ) যদি দানের এমতি রীতি—C. U. MS. No. 305.
 (গ) যদি দানের এমন গতি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

The version (ক) is not in keeping with the rhythm of the song. The other two versions are all right.

- (g) (ক) তুমি ত গোকুল পতি—Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).
 (খ) তবে হে গোকুল পতি—Vaishnavapadalahari and C. U. MS. No. 305.

Of the above two versions we prefer the version (খ). The word 'তবে' is very suggestive here.

- (h) (ক) আমরা চলিতে না জানি কহিতে না জানি
 —Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).
 (খ) চলিতে না জানি চাহিতে না জানি
 —C. U. MS. No. 305 and Parishad MS. No. 953.

- (i) (ক) কেবা নাহি পরে—C. U. MS. No. 305,
 Vaishnavapadalahari and Padakalpataru
 (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).
 (খ) কোথা নাহি পরে—Parishad MS. No. 953.

- (j) (ক) সে কেনে তোমাকে বাজে—C. U. MS. No. 305.
 (খ) তোমারে কেনে বা বাজে—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā and Parishad).

- (k) (ক) গোবিন্দ কহে—C. U. MS. No. 305 and
 Vaishnavapadalahari.
 (খ) জ্ঞানদাস কহে—Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).

Now let us give the whole song as it stands after the above additions and alterations have been made :

সিঙ্কড়া ।

শুন শুন শুন স্তম্ভন কানাই
 তুমি সে নূতন দানী ।
 বিকি কিনির দান গো-রসে মানিয়ে
 বেশের দান কভু নাহি শুনি ॥
 সিঁথায় সিন্দূর নয়ানে কাজর
 রঞ্জন আলতা পায় ।
 একি বিকি কিনির ধন নারীর বেশন
 ইথে কার কিবা দায় ॥
 মণি আভরণ সুরঙ্গ শাড়ী
 জাদ কেবা নাহি পরে ।
 যদি দানের এমতি গতি তুমি ত গোঁকুল পতি
 দান সাধহ ঘরে ঘরে ॥
 আমরা চলিতে না জানি কহিতে না জানি
 তোমারে কেনে বা বাজে ।
 গোবিন্দ কহে কেমনে জানিব
 পরের মনের কাজে ॥

2. Different readings in the song—চললি রাজপথে রাই
 স্তম্ভনগরী.....

- (a) (ক) পাঠাডিয়া রাগ—C. U. MS. No. 305.
 (খ) ভাটিয়ারি—Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).
 (গ) সারঙ্গ—Parishad MS. No. 953.

- (b) (ক) চললি রাজপথে রাই সুনাগরী—C. U. MS. No. 305
and Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).
(খ) চললি রাজপথে রাই বিনোদিনী—C. U. MS. No. 304
and Vaishnavapadalāharī.
- (c) (ক) নানা বেশ করি অঙ্গে—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā).
(খ) নাস বেশ করি অঙ্গে—Vaishnavapadalāharī.
(গ) নাস বেশ করি অঙ্গে—Padakalpataru (Parishad).
- (d) (ক) বেনন—Padakalpataru (Parishad).
(খ) বেলন—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā) and
Vaishnavapadalāharī.
- (e) (ক) সিঁথায় সিন্দূর—Vaishnavapadalāharī and
Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā and Parishad).
(খ) সুরঙ্গ সিন্দূর—Parishad MS. No. 953 and
C. U. MS. No. 304.
- (f) (ক) অলকা তিলকা চাকু ভালে—Vaishnavapadalāharī
and Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā).
(খ) অলকা তিলকা শোভে ভালে—C. U. MS. No. 305.
(গ) অলকা তিলকা তাহে ভালে—C. U. MS. No. 304.
- (g) (ক) গীমে সুরেশ্বরী হার—Padakalpataru.
(খ) গীমে শতেশ্বরী হার—C. U. MS. No. 304.
(গ) গীমে সুরেশ্বরী হার—Parishad MS. No. 953.
- (h) (ক) চরণ কমলে রাতুল আলতা—Padakalpataru,
Vaishnavapadalāharī and C. U. MS. No. 304.
(খ) চরণ কমল তলে রঙ্গন আলতা—C. U. MS. No. 305.

The version (খ) is defective in rhythm. The line taken separately is quite all right, but it does not keep perfect

time with the rhythmic movement of the whole song. Such a defect in rhythm cannot be expected from a poet like Govindadāsa, who is a perfect master of form.

- (i) (ক) বিচিত্র কাঁচুলী—Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā) and C. U. MS. No. 304.
 (খ) চিত্রের কাঁচুলী—C. U. MS. No. 305.
 (গ) চিত্রের কাঁচুলী—Parishad MS. No. 953.

The version (গ) is defective in rhythm.

- (j) (ক) ও রূপ যোবনে—Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā), Vaishnavapadalahari and C. U. MS. No. 304.
 (খ) এ রূপ লাবনী—C. U. MS. No. 305.
 (গ) এ রূপ মাধুরী—Parishad MS. No. 953.

- (k) (ক) জিতবি নিকুঞ্জ রাজে—Vaishnavapadalahari, Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā) and C. U. MS. No. 304.
 (খ) জিতব মদন রাজে—C. U. MS. No. 305.

The version (ক) is more perfect in rhythm.

Now let us give the whole song as it stands after all these additions and alterations :

ভাটিয়ারী ।

চলিল রাজ পথে রাই সুনগরী
 নাস বেশ করি অঙ্গে ।
 যুত দধি দুখে সাজাইয়া পসরা
 প্রিয় সহচরি করি সঙ্গে ॥

বেনন পাটের জাদে বাক্সিয়া কবরী
 বেড়িয়া মালতী-মালে ।
 সিঁথায় সিন্দূর লোচনে কাজর
 অলকা তিলকা চারু ভালে ॥
 মণি আভরণ শ্রবণে কুণ্ডল
 গীমে শতেশরী হার ।
 রূপ নিরুপম বিচিত্র কাঁচুলী
 পীন পয়োধর ভার ॥
 চরণ কমলে রাতুল আলতা
 বাজন নূপুর বাজে ।
 গোবিন্দদাস ভণে ওরূপ ঘোবনে
 জিতব নিকুঞ্জ-রাজে ॥

3. Different readings in the song—এইত বৃন্দাবন পথে নিতি
 নিতি করি গতায়াতে.....

- (a) (ক) নিতি নিতি করি গতায়াতে—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā
 and Parishad).
 (খ) নিতি নিতি করি যাতায়াতে—Vaishnavapadalāhari.
 নিতি নিতি করি গতাগতি—C. U. MS. No. 305.
- (b) (ক) যদি হাথে করি লইয়ে সোণা—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā
 and Parishad).
 (খ) যদি হাতে করি লই যাই সোণা—Vaishnavapadalāhari
 and C. U. MS. No. 305.
- (c) (ক) তুমি কেনা কহে কোন জনা—Padakalpataru
 (Parishad edition).
 (খ) তুমি কে না কহে একজন—Vaishnavapadalāhari
 and C. U. MS. No. 305.

- (গ) কেহ ত না বলে কোন জনা—Parishad MS. No. 953.
 (ঘ) তুমি কে না কহে হেন জনা—Padakalpataru
 (Baṭṭalā edition).

- (d) (ক) তুমি দোষ পুছই বড়াই—Vaishnavapadalāharī.
 (খ) তুমি দেখি পুছই বড়াই—Padakalpataru (Parishad
 and Baṭṭalā) and C. U. MS. No. 305.

We prefer the version (খ). Here the word ‘দোষ’ has got no significance.

- (e) (ক) দান চাহেন—C. U. MS. No. 305, Padakalpataru
 (Parishad and Baṭṭalā) and Vaishnavapadalāharī.
 (খ) দান মাগেন—Parishad MS. No. 953.

- (f) (ক) তাহে কেনে এতেক জঞ্জাল—Padakalpataru (Parishad
 and Baṭṭalā), and Vaishnavapadalāharī.
 (খ) তাহে কিবা এতেক ঝকড়া—C. U. MS. No. 305.

- (g) (ক) কহতহি গোবিন্দদাস—Padakalpataru (Parishad and
 Baṭṭalā) and Vaishnavapadalāharī.
 (খ) দেখতহি গোবিন্দদাস—Parishad MS. No. 953.

We prefer the version (ক). The version “দেখতহি গোবিন্দদাস” is not at all sensible here. In the immediately preceding line we get the expression “দূর কর হাস পরিহাস.” The two lines “দূর কর হাস পরিহাস” and “দেখতহি গোবিন্দদাস” cannot be linked together. It should be “দূর কর হাস পরিহাস। কহতহি গোবিন্দদাস।”

- (h) (ক) তাহে আছে স্বত দুখ দধি।
 ইহাতেই পাইবে কোন নিধি ॥

—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) সবে আছে য়ত দুখ দধি ।
 ইহাতে পাইবে কোন নিধি ॥

—Parishad MS. No. 953.

The above two versions are not to be found in any of the published anthologies of Vaishnava songs, such as, the Padakalpataru, the Vaishnavapadalāharī, the Padakalpalatikā, the Padāmrītasamudra and others, nor in any of the published editions of the songs of Govindadās, nor even in the Aprakāshita Padaratnāvalī (অপ্রকাশিত পদরত্নাবলী), a collection of unpublished Vaishnava songs, published by the Sāhitya Parishad. When we get these two lines in more than one manuscript, we can include them in the body of the song.

Now let us quote the whole song as it stands after all these additions and alterations.

বরাড়ী

এই ত বৃন্দাবন পথে ।
 নিতি নিতি করি গতায়াতে ॥
 যদি হাতে করি লই যাই সোণা ।
 তুমি কে না কহে কোন জনা ॥
 তুমি দেখি পুছহ বড়াই ।
 কিসের দান চাহেন কানাই ॥ প্র ॥
 সঙ্গে সবে য়তের পসার ।
 তাহে কেনে এতেক জঞ্জাল ॥
 তাহে আছে য়ত দুখ দধি ।
 ইহাতে পাইবে কোন নিধি ॥
 তুমি ত বরজ-যুবরাজ ।
 তুমি কেনে করিবে অকাজ ॥

দূর কর হাস পরিহাস ।
কহতহি গোবিন্দদাস ॥

4. Different readings in the song—পহিল সম্ভাষণে চির
অনুরাগী.....

This song is not to be found in the Padakalpataru, the Padakalpalatikā or the Padāmritasamudra. Among the published anthologies of Vaishnava songs, the Vaishnavapadalāharī only contains it. We find the song, however, in the Calcutta University Manuscripts Nos. 304 and 324.

(a) (ক) ধানশ্রী—Vaishnavapadalāharī, C. U. MS. No. 324.

(খ) কেদার—C. U. MS. No. 324.

(b) (ক) মিলল দুহুঁ তনু গলে গল লাগি ॥—Vaishnavapadalāharī
and C. U. MS. No. 304.

(খ) মিলল দুহুঁ দৌহার গলে গলে লাগি ॥

—C. U. MS. No. 324.

We prefer the version (ক). The rhythmic music of the song has been greatly disturbed in the version (খ).

(c) (ক) তঁহি প্রিয় সঙ্গিনী পরম রসাল—Vaishnavapadalāharī.

(খ) কোই প্রিয় সঙ্গিনী পরম রসাল—C. U. MS. No. 324.

(গ) তঁহি প্রিয় সখী কোই পরম রসাল—C. U. MS. No. 304.

(d) (ক) দুহুঁ গলে দেয়ল দুহুঁ ফুল মালা—Vaishnavapadalāharī.

(খ) দুহুঁ গলে দেয়ল একু ফুল মালা—C. U. MS. No. 324.

(গ) দুহুঁ গলে দেয়ল দুহুঁ দুহুঁ মালা—C. U. MS. No. 304.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the MS. No. 324. The next line is --“টুটছ্ জানি দুছ্ পড়লহি বন্ধ।” Krishna and Rādhā sat very close to each other or embraced each other very tightly lest the garland might be torn to pieces by the slightest movement of their bodies. This is the idea. Such an idea could not arise at all had the female attendants put two separate garlands round the necks of Rādhā and Krishna, as we get it in the versions (ক) and (গ). Rādhā and Krishna must have been entangled by only one garland, and the garland must have been a very short one. This was deliberately done by the female attendants of Rādhā to enjoy the beautiful sight of Rādhā and Krishna closely embracing each other. There must have been only one garland round their necks, otherwise the expression—“টুটছ্ জানি দুছ্ পড়লহি বন্ধ”—could have no significance in the poem.

(e) (ক) টুটছ্ জানি দুছ্ পড়লহি বন্ধ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

(খ) টুটএ জানি পুন পড়লহি বন্ধ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(গ) টুটছ্ জানি দুছ্ পড়লছ্ বন্ধ—C. U. MS. No. 304.

Of the above three versions we prefer that of the MS. No. 324. The versions—“টুটএ জানি পুন পড়লহি বন্ধ” and “টুটছ্ জানি দুছ্ পড়লছ্ বন্ধ”—are quite sensible. According to these two versions Rādhā and Krishna were in great perplexity, being conscious of the fact that the garland might be damaged by the slightest movement of their bodies. The idea is quite clear and the reading is quite sensible. But if we once look at the next line—“দৈবে বাড়ায়ল হৃদয় আনন্দ” we are bound to admit that the version of the C. U. MS. No. 324 is far more happy and suggestive. In the line “দৈবে বাড়ায়ল হৃদয় আনন্দ” the poet means to say that the pleasure of embracing each other was a mere gift of chance. They (Rādhā and Krishna) had no idea

of embracing each other, it was their first union. Now as fate would have it, they were tightly fastened round their necks by a single garland. This gave them the chance of embracing each other. This is the idea. Now if we accept the versions “টুটএ জানি পুন পড়লহঁ ধন্ধ” or “টুটহঁ জানি দুহঁ পড়লহঁ ধন্ধ” the above beautiful idea does not hold good. The two versions (খ) and (গ) give us the idea that Rādhā and Krishna were in great perplexity, lest they might damage the garland by the slightest movement of their bodies. This is all right so long as it stands by itself. But the moment we read it in connection with its immediately succeeding line—“দৈবে বাঢ়ায়ল হৃদয় আনন্দ”—it loses much of its charm and sensibility. How can perplexity enhance pleasure? It was not ধন্ধ (perplexity) but বন্ধ (embrace) that gave them pleasure. We accept the version of the C. U. MS. No. 324.

(f) (ক) সখীর বচন শুনি আনন্দ ভেলি—Vaishnavapadalāharī.

(খ) দূতীর বয়ান হেরি আনন্দ ভেলি—C. U. MS. No. 324.

(গ) সখীর বদন হেরি আনন্দ ভেলি—C. U. MS. No. 304.

(g) (ক) দুহঁ গল মাল দূতী গলে দেলি—Vaishnavapadalāharī.

(খ) দুহঁ অঙ্গ হার দুহঁ অঙ্গে দেলি—C. U. MS. No. 304.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalāharī. In the immediately preceding line we find that the female attendant who arranged everything for the union of Rādhā and Krishna, appeared before them and that Rādhā and Krishna were highly pleased with her. So here it is most natural that they (Rādhā and Krishna) would each present a garland to her. The version of the Padalāharī gives us this idea, and we accept this version. The version (খ) is not happy. According to this version Rādhā and Krishna exchanged garlands. This is not at all

applicable here. What business they could have to exchange garlands at the moment when they were so much pleased at the sight of the Dūtī (female attendant)? Is it not natural that they would present their garlands to the Dūtī, who took so much trouble for them?

(h) (ক) ঐহন চিরদিন রহু অঙ্গে অঙ্গ—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

(খ) ঐহন চিরদিন রহু রসরঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Vaishnavapadalaharī. The expression “রসরঙ্গ” is not very happy at this stage, when they met for the first time. The expression “অঙ্গে অঙ্গ” is more in keeping with the spirit of the song. In this song we find that the female attendants of Rādhā very cleverly put a short garland round the necks of Rādhā and Krishna, compelling them to sit very close to each other, touching each other's body. After this it is really very suggestive for Govindadās, the maker of the song, to wish that Rādhā and Krishna might remain so close to each other for eternity.

(i) (ক) রতিপতি জানি কভু না করে বিভঙ্গ—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

(খ) রতিপতি জন্ম করয়ে নানা রঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Here also we prefer the version of the Vaishnavapadalaharī.

(j) (ক) ঐহে প্রেম কহু না হয় বিচ্ছেদ—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

(খ) ঐহন পিরীতি কহু না হউ বিচ্ছেদ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

Now let us give the whole song as it stands after all these additions and alterations.

ধানশী

পহিল সম্ভাষণে চির অনুরাগী ।
 মিলল দুহুঁ তনু গলে গল লাগি ॥
 কোই প্রিয় সঙ্গিনী পরম রসাল ।
 দুহুঁ গলে দেয়ল একু ফুল-মালা ॥
 টুটুহু জানি দুহুঁ পড়লহি বন্ধ ।
 দৈব বাড়ায়ল হৃদয় আনন্দ ॥
 সখীর বয়ান হেরি আনন্দ ভেলি ।
 দুহুঁ গলমাল দূতী গলে দেলি ॥
 রাখল মরম সোহাগিনী নাম ।
 পরসাদ পাই দূতী করল পয়াণ ॥
 ঐছন চিরদিন রহু অঙ্গে অঙ্গ ।
 রতিপতি জানি কভু না কর বিভঙ্গ ॥
 ঐছে প্রেম কভু না হয় বিচ্ছেদ ।
 গোবিন্দদাসে রহু অই খেদ ॥

5. Different readings in regard to the song—নবনীরদ তনু
তড়িত লতা জন্ম—

- (a) (ক) নটনারায়ণ—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 (খ) স্নুহই—C. U. MS. No. 302.
 (গ) যথারাগ—C. U. MS. No. 305.
- (b) (ক) বলিত অতি আকুল—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 (খ) বলিত অলি আকুল—C. U. MS. No. 302.
- (c) (ক) মদন মন্তুর গতি ভাতি—Vaishnavapadalahari.
 (খ) মদ মন্তুর গতি ভাতি—C. U. MS. No. 302.
 (গ) মদন গদ গদ গতি—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(d) (ক) নয়ন তরঙ্গিম—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) তাহে মনোরম—C. U. MS. No. 302.

(e) (ক) নবনীরদ তনু মণ্ডিত লতা জন্ম—Padakalpataru
(Battalā)

(খ) নবনীরদ তনু তড়িত লতা জন্ম—Vaishnavapada-
lahari, C. U. MS. No. 302 and MS. No. 305.

Of the above two versions we prefer the version (খ). Here the complexion of Krishna has been compared to that of new clouds. So the bright yellow cloth hanging behind his (Krishna's) back can well be compared to a flash of lightning. But we cannot imagine what has cloud to do with a creeper (লতা). In the version (খ) also, we get the word 'লতা,' but there we get it as a part of the compound-word তড়িত-লতা, which means a flash of lightning.

(f) (ক) কমল নীত চরণ কমল মধু—Vaishnavapadalahari,
Padakalpataru (Battala) and C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) কমলা লালিত চরণ কমল মধু—C. U. MS. No. 302.

Of the above two versions we prefer the version (খ). The expression “কমল নীত” is not at all clear in sense. The other version “কমলা লালিত” is quite sensible and clear, meaning “served by Kamalā, the Goddess of fortune.”

(g) (ক) পাওয়ে সোই স্বজান—Vaishnavapadalahari,
Padakalpataru (Battalā) and C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) মধু পায়ে সোই স্বজান—C. U. MS. No. 302.

নটনারায়ণ ।

নব-নীরদ তনু তড়িত লতা জন্ম
 পীত পতনি বনি ভাল ।
 মালতী-বকুল বলিত অতি আকুল
 মৌলি মিলিত বন-মাল ॥
 পেখনু কালিন্দী-কুল বিলাসী ।
 হেলি কলপতরু তরুণী-মোহন
 বাণ্ডয়ে বিনোদিয়া বাঁশী ॥
 মণিময় অভরণ নূপুর রণবাণ
 মদন মন্ত্র গতি ভাতি ।
 গীম বিভঙ্গিম নয়ন তরঙ্গিম
 কত কুলবতী মতি মাতি ॥
 কমলা লালিত চরণ-কমল-মধু
 পাণ্ডয়ে সেই সৃজান ।
 রাজা নরসিংহ রূপ নারায়ণ—
 গোবিন্দদাস অনুমান ॥

6. Different readings in regard to the song—ত্রিভুবন বিজয়ী
 মদন মহারাজ—

- (a) (ক) শ্রীরাগ—C. U. MS. No. 305.
 (খ) সূহৃৎ—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā and Parishad),
 Padalaharī.
 (b) (ক) তোহে কহো গোপিনি আয়ানের রাণি—Padakalpataru
 (Parishad).
 (খ) তোহে কহো আলো রাধে আয়ানের রাণী
 —C. U. MS. No. 305 and Parishad MS. No. 953.

(c) (ক) তুহঁ গজ-গামিনী হরি জিনি মাঝ—Vaishnavapadalahari,
Padakalpataru (Parishad and Battalā).

(খ) এ গজ-গামিনি ধনি হরি জিনি মাঝ—C. U. MS. No. 305
and Parishad MS. No. 953.

(d) (ক) মোহে গিরিধর বলি সৌপল কাজ—Padakalpataru
(Parishad and Battala), Vaishnavapadalahari,
and C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) তোহে গিরিধর বলি মোহে সৌপল কাজ
—C. U. MS. No. 305.

Of the above two versions that of the Padakalpataru is to be preferred. In this song Krishna is addressing Rādhā all along. Rādhā's answer will follow in the next song. So the expression 'তোহে গিরিধর বলি মোহে সৌপল কাজ' is not at all sensible here.

সুহই

ত্রিভুবন-বিজয়ী মদন মহারাজ ।
বৈঠল বৃন্দাবনে নিকুঞ্জক মাঝ ॥
গোরস আওত রসবতী ঠাম ।
স্বজিল বিপিন-পথে সরবস দান ॥
তোহে কহৌ গোপিনি আয়ানের রাণী ।
কেমনে জানিবা দান সহজে আয়ানি ॥
তুহঁ গজ-গামিনী হরি জিনি মাঝ ।
নব যৌবন-মদে নাহি দেহ রাজ ॥
মোহে গিরিধর বলি সৌপল কাজ ।
আপনে আপন কথা কহিতেহ লাজ ॥
কেবল গোরস-দানে কেনে দেহ ভঙ্গ ।
বিচারে চাহিয়ে দান প্রতি অঙ্গে অঙ্গ ॥

এ সব দানের কথা জানয়ে বড়াই ।

গোবিন্দদাস কহে চপল কানাই ॥

7. Different readings in regard to the song—কালিন্দী তীর
সুধীর সমীরণ.....

- (a) (ক) ধানশ্রী—Vaishnavapadalahari.
(খ) কেদার—Padakalpataru.
(গ) বরাড়ী—C. U. MS. No. 324.
- (b) (ক) মধুর নিধুবনে—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā).
(খ) মধুবনে নিধুবনে—C. U. MS. No. 324 and
Padakalpataru (Parishad).
- (c) (ক) মুগধ মুরারি—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā).
(খ) লুবধ মুরারি—C. U. MS. No. 324.
- (d) (ক) বৃকভানু কুমারী—Padakalpataru (Parishad).
(খ) বৃকভানু কিশোরী—Padarashasāra, Padakalpataru
(Baṭṭalā), Vaishnavapadalahari and
C. U. MS. No. 324.
- (e) (ক) নটশেখর—Vaishnavapadalahari, Padakalpataru
(Parishad and Baṭṭalā).
(খ) নট শশধর—C. U. MS. No. 324.
(গ) নটবর শেখর—C. U. MS. No. 305.

Of the above three versions we prefer the version (ক). The expression 'নটশেখর' is more happy than 'নটশশধর.' The reading 'নটবর শেখর' is also happy and expressive, but it spoils the rhythm.

(f) (ক) শ্যামর গোর গোরী সঙ্গে শ্যামর—Vaishnavapadalaharī.

(খ) শ্যামের গোরী গোর সঙ্গে শ্যামর—C. U. MS. No. 324.

(গ) শ্যাম গোরী গোরী সঙ্গে শ্যামর—Parishad MS. No. 953.

(g) (ক) নব জলধরে জন্ম বিজুরী বিরাজ—Vaishnavapadalaharī
and Padakalpataru.

(খ) নব জলধরে জন্ম বিজুলি বিকাশ—Padakalpataru.

(গ) নব জলধরে যৈছে বিজুরী বিকাশ

—Parishad MS. No. 953.

All the above three versions are equally sensible and expressive. Still we reject the versions (খ) and (গ) owing to their bad rhyming. The immediately preceding line is 'গাওত নটিনী নাচ নটরাজ.' The rhyming of 'নটরাজ' with 'বিকাশ' is far from being happy. The rhyming of 'নটরাজ' with 'বিরাজ' is quite happy. So we prefer the version (ক).

(h) (ক) হেরি হেরি অপরূপ রাস কলারস—Vaishnavapadalaharī,
Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā and Parishad).

(খ) হেরি হেরি রাস বিলাস মনোহর—Parishad MS. No. 953.

(i) (ক) মন্থথে লাগল মন্থথ ধন্ধ—Vaishnavapadalaharī and
Padakalpataru.

(খ) লাগল মন্থথে ধন্ধ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

The version of the Vaishnavapadalaharī is more perfectly in keeping with the rhythm of its preceding lines.

- (j) (ক) উয়ল গগনে সঘনে রজনীকর—Vaishnavapadalāharī.
 (খ) উয়ল গগনে সগনে রজনীকর—C. U. MS. No. 324.
 (গ) ভুলল গগনে সগণে রজনীকর—Padakalpataru
 (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).

Of the above three versions we can reject the version (ক) at the first sight. The expression 'সঘনে' has got no significance here. It should be 'সগণে রজনীকর' as we find it in the other two versions. The expression 'সগণে রজনীকর' means—'The moon with his attendants (সগণে).' The attendants of the moon, of course, mean the stars.

- (k) (ক) চৌদিশে ফিরত দীপ ধরি চন্দ—Vaishnavapadalāharī.
 (খ) চৌদিগে ফিরত দীপধারী ছন্দ—C. U. MS. No. 324.
 (গ) চৌদিশে ফিরত দীপধর ছন্দ—Padakalpataru
 (Parishad).

- (l) (ক) নাচত ময়ূর মন্ত মধুকর—Padakalpataru.
 (খ) নাচত ময়ূর ভোর মন্ত মধুকর—Vaishnavapadalāharī
 and C. U. MS. No. 324.

- (m) (ক) জগজন মোহন—Vaishnavapadalāharī.
 (খ) জগমন মোহন—C. U. MS. No. 324 and
 Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).

- (n) (ক) বিহরই ভেল কলপসম রাতি—Vaishnavapadalāharī
 and Padakalpataru (Parishad).
 (খ) বিহনই ভেল কলপসম রাতি—C. U. MS. No. 324
 and Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā).

Of the above two versions we prefer the version (ক). In this song the poet describes the happy union of Rādhā and Krishna. So the expression 'বিহনই' (without him) is not at all significant here.

কেদার ।

কালিন্দী তীর সুধীর সমীরণ
 কুন্দ কুমুদ অরবিন্দ বিকাশ ।
 নাচত মৌর ভোর মত্ত মধুকর
 সারী শুক পিক পঞ্চম ভাষ ॥
 মধুর নিধুবনে মুগ্ধ মুরারি ।
 মুগ্ধ গোপ বধু অধিক লাখ সঞে
 রঞ্জে বিহরে বৃকভানু-কুমারী ॥
 নাচত নটিনী গায় নটশেখর
 গাওত নটিনী নাচ নটরাজ ।
 শ্যামর গোরী গোরী সঞে শ্যামর
 নব জলধরে জনু বিজুরী বিরাজ ॥
 হেরি হেরি অপরূপ বয়স কলারস
 মনমথে লাগল মনমথ ধন্দ ।
 ভুলল গগনে সগণে রজনীকর
 চৌদিশে ফিরত দীপধর ছন্দ ॥
 তারাগণ সঞে তারাপতি হেরি
 লাজে লুকাইল দিনমণি-কাঁতি ।
 গোবিন্দদাস পছ' ভগ-মন-মোহন
 বিহরই ভেল কলপসম রাতি ॥

8. Different readings in regard to the song—না জানি কোন
 মথুরা সঞে আয়ল.....

(a) (ক) না জানিয়ে কোন মথুরা সঞে আয়ল—Vaishnava-
 padalahari.

(খ) না জানি কো মথুরা সঞে আয়ল—Padakalpataru
 (Baṭṭalā and Parishad).

(গ) না জানি একে মথুরা সঞে আয়ল—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(b) (ক) তাহে হেরি কাহে জৌউ কাঁপ—Padakalpataru and
C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) তাহে হেরি জৌউ মোর কাঁপ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(c) (ক) সখিহে অব কুশল শত নাহি মানি—Vaishnavapadalahari
and C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) সজনি অকুশল শত নাহি মানি—Padakalpataru
(Parishad and Baṭṭalā).

Of the above two versions we prefer that of the Padakalpataru. The next line runs thus—

বিপদক লাখ তৃণহুঁ করি না গণিয়ে
কানু বিচ্ছেদ হোয় জানি ॥

There are numerous dangers and obstacles in the way. But Rādhā cares them not. So the expression ‘অকুশল শত নাহি মানি।’ ‘I don’t care a hundred dangers.’ is quite sensible here. The version ‘অব কুশল শত নাহি মানি।’ is quite meaningless here.

(d) (ক) লোরে নয়ন-যুগ কাঁপ—Padakalpataru.

(খ) লোরে নয়ন দুহুঁ কাঁপ—Vaishnavapadalahari and
C. U. MS. No. 305.

(e) (ক) চিত না রহে থির—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā and
Parishad).

(খ) মতি না রহে থির—Vaishnavapadalahari and
C. U. MS. No. 305.

(f) (ক) জাগরে নিদ্ নাহি ভায়—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

(খ) জাগরে নিন্দ নাহি যায়—C. U. MS. No. 305 and
Parishad MS No. 953.

(g) (ক) সঘনে রোয়ত শুক শারী—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).

(খ) স্করুণ রোয় শুক শারী—C. U. MS No. 305.

(h) (ক) গড়ল মনোরথ—Vaishnavapadalahari and
C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) গড়ল মনমথ—Padakalpataru.

(গ) গড়ল মন্থথ—C. U. MS. No. 324.

The version (গ) is defective in rhythm. The version of the Padakalpataru is correct. The whole sentence is—
'গড়ল মনমথ তৈখনে টুটল'—(Alas the God of love has demolished the edifice of love just after building it up). The expression 'মনোরথ' has got no significance here.

(i) (ক) বিপদক লাখ তৃণহঁ করি না গণিয়ে—Padakalpataru
(Baṭṭalā and Parishad), C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) বিপদহঁ লাখ তৃণ করি না গণিয়ে
—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(j) (ক) কানু বিচ্ছেদ হয়ে জানি—Vaishnavapadalahari and
Padakalpataru.

(খ) কানুক বিচ্ছেদ জানি—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(k) (ক) তৈখনে টুটল—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) তৈখনে ভাঙ্গত—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā and
Parishad).

(গ) তৈখনে ভাঙ্গয়ে—Parishad MS. No. 953 and
C. U. MS. No. 305.

সুহই

না জানি কো মথুরা সঞে আসল
 তাহে হেরি জীউ মোর কাঁপ ।
 তব ধরি দখিণ গয়োধর ফুরয়ে
 লোরে নয়ন যুগ বাঁপ ॥
 সজনি, অকুশল শত নাহি মানি ।
 বিপদক লাখ তৃণছঁ করি না গণিয়ে
 কানু বিছেদ হয়ে জানি ॥
 কিয়ে ঘর বাহির চিত না রহে থির
 জাগরে নিঁদ নাহি ভায় ।
 গড়ল মনমথ তৈখনে টুটল
 কিয়ে সখি করব উপায় ॥
 কুসুমিত কুঞ্জে ভ্রমর নাহি গুঞ্জয়ে
 সঘনে রোয়ত শুক শারী ।
 গোবিন্দদাস আনি সখী পুছহ
 কাহে এত বিধিনি বিথারি ॥

9. Different readings in regard to the song—নামহি অকুর
 কুর নাহি বা সম.....

(a) (ক) কুর নাহি বা সম—Padakalpataru (Battalā and Parishad) and Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) কুর নীচাশয়—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(b) (ক) কালি কালিছঁ সাজ—Padakalpataru (Battalā and Parishad).

(খ) কালিনী কালিম সাজ—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(গ) কালিন্দী কালিম সাজ—C. U. MS. No. 305.

Of the above three versions we prefer the version (ক). The other two versions are not at all acceptable. The whole sentence is this—

ঘরে ঘরে ঘোষই শ্রবণ-অমঙ্গল
কালি কালিহঁ সাজ ॥

Now the expression ‘শ্রবণ-অমঙ্গল’ is an adjective. It must qualify something. If we accept the version (ক), there remains nothing to complain, for in this version we get the adjective ‘শ্রবণ-অমঙ্গল’ qualifying—“কালি কালিহঁ সাজ ।” (make preparations for your journey to-morrow). This news was certainly very painful to the people of Vrindābana. So it has been rightly qualified by the adjective ‘শ্রবণ-অমঙ্গল.’ The other two versions are not at all sensible. We cannot make out how the adjective ‘শ্রবণ-অমঙ্গল’ can qualify the expression—‘কালিনী কালিম সাজ’ or ‘কালিন্দী কালিম সাজ.’ One might think that in these versions we get a description of the ugly dress and appearance of অক্রুর. But then, how can one’s dress or appearance, appear painful to one’s ears?

(c) (ক) নখতর চাঁদ বেকত রহ অম্বরে—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) নাখতক চাঁদ বেকত রহ অম্বরে—C. U. MS. No. 305.

Of the above two versions we prefer the version (ক). Both the versions are sensible. But the version (ক) seems more happy. Akrūra has come to Vrindābana to take away Krishna to Mathura. They will start in the next morning. So Rādhā prays to the Goddess ষোগিনী—(the Goddess of the full-moon) to make the night eternal and endless. She says—“Let the moon and stars shine in the sky so that there may be no morning (বৈছে নহে পরভাত). This is what we get from the version (ক). The other version uses the expression ‘নাখতক চাঁদ’ in the place of ‘নখতর চাঁদ.’ The expression ‘নাখতক’ means ‘undisturbed.’ The whole

sentence would thus mean—‘let the moon remain undisturbed (নাখতক). So that morning may not come at all.’

(d) (ক) সেবি তাহে ভাখহ—Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā and Parishad).

(খ) সেবি তাহে ভাখর—Vaishnavapadalāharī and Parishad MS. No. 953.

(গ) সেবি তাহে ভাঙ্কর—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(e) (ক) বৈছে নহত পরভাতে—Padakalpataru (Parishad).

(খ) বৈছে নহ পরভাত—Vaishnavapadalāharī, Padakalpataru (Baṭṭalā) and C. U. MS. No. 305.

(f) (ক) রাখব নিজ অনুগাতে—Vaishnavapadalāharī.

(খ) সো রাখউ নিজ তাতে—Padakalpataru (Parishad and Baṭṭalā).

(গ) সো রাখব নিজ তাতে—C. U. MS. No. 305.

All the above three versions are sensible. According to the version (ক) Rādhā says—she would pray to the Goddess Kālindī (কালিন্দী) and by doing so, would bring the sun within her control (রাখব নিজ অনুগাতে), so that the sun may not rise in the morning. This is quite all right. But we get a more suggestive and happy reading in the other two versions. The river কালিন্দী (যমুনা) according to our mythology is the daughter of the Sun-God. So the expression “সো রাখব নিজ তাতে” (she would detain the sun, her father) is very suggestive and expressive.

সুহৃদ

নামহি অক্ষর

কুর নাহি বা সম

সো আওল ব্রজ মাঝ ।

ঘরে ঘরে ঘাঘই

শ্রবণ-অমঙ্গল

কালি কালিছঁ সাজ ॥

সজনি, রজনী পোহাইলে কালি ।

রচহ উপায় যৈছে নহ প্রাতর

মন্দিরে রহ বনমালী ॥

যোগিনী-চরণ

শরণ করি সাধহ

বান্ধহ যামিনী-নাথে ।

নখতর চান্দ

বেকত রহ অম্বরে

যৈছে ন হত পরভাতে ॥

কালিন্দী দেবী

সেবি তাহে ভাখহ

সো রাখউ নিজ তাতে ।

কীয়ে শমন আনি

তুরিতে মিলাওব

গোবিন্দদাস অনুমাতে ॥

10. Different readings in regard to the song—কালি হাম
কুঞ্জে কান্নু যব ভেট—

(a) (ক) নিরমদ নয়ান বয়ান করু হেঁট—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) নিরদ নয়ান বয়ান রহু হেঁট—C. U. MS. No. 305.

The expressions 'নিরদ নয়ান' and 'নিরমদ নয়ান' are both equally suggestive. The word নিরদ means cloud; here it has been used as an adjective, meaning cloudy, hence full of tears. The word নিরমদ means pensive, gloomy. Thus both the versions give us almost the same idea.

(b) (ক) না জানিয়ে ঐছে পড়ব পরমাদ—Vaishnavapada-
lahari, Padakalpataru (Battalā and Parishad).

(খ) কো জানে ঐছে হোয়ব পরমাদ—C. U. MS.No. 305

and Parishad MS. No. 953.

(c) (ক) এ সখি অব মোহে কহবি বিশেষ—Vaishnavapada-
laharī and Padakalpataru (Parishad
and Baṭṭalā).

(খ) এ সখি কহ মোরে বচন বিশেষ—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(গ) এ সখি অব মোহে কহবি বিশেষ—Parishad MS.
No. 953.

(d) (ক) আনবি ভাতি রভস-রস-কেলি—Vaishnavapadalāharī
and C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) আনহি ভাতি রভস-রস-কেলি—Padakalpataru
(Parishad and Baṭṭalā).

The expression ‘আনবি’ in the version (ক) is not at all sensible here. It should be ‘আনহি’ as we find it in the version (খ). The sentence ‘আনহি ভাতি রভস-রস-কেলি’ means—
‘All love-makings took a different colour.’

(e) (ক) পুছইতে কহ গদ গদ আধ বোল—Vaishnavapada-
laharī, Padakalpataru and C. U. MS. No. 305.

(খ) পুছইতে কহতহি গদ গদ বোল—Parishad MS.
No. 953.

(f) (ক) যোতহুঁ কপট কৈছে হিয় মহা গোই—C. U. MS.
No. 305 and Vaishnavapadalāharī.

(খ) এতহুঁ কপট কৈছে হিয় মাহা গোই—Padakalpataru.

Of the above two versions we prefer the version (খ). The expression ‘যোতহুঁ’ has got no significance here. It should be ‘এতহুঁ’ (so much). Rādhā says—‘How could I know that there might be so much intrigue behind it.’

সুহিণী

কালি হাম কুঞ্জ কানু যব ভেট ।

নিরমদ নয়ান বয়ান করু হেট ॥

মান-ভরমে হাম হাসি হাসি সাধ ।
 না জানিয়ে ঐছে পড়ব পরমাদ ॥
 এ সখি অব মোহে কহবি বিশেষ ।
 জানলুঁ কানু চলব পরদেশ ॥
 পুছইতে কহ গদ গদ আধ বোল ।
 ঢর ঢর নয়ন হেরি মুখ মোর ॥
 নিবিড় আলিঙ্গনে রহ পুন ধন্দ ।
 দরদর হৃদয় শিথিল ভুজ-বন্ধ ॥
 চুষনে বদনে বদনে রহ মেলি ।
 আনহি ভাতি রভস-রস-কেলি ॥
 এতলুঁ কপট কৈছে হিয় মাহা গোই ।
 গোবিন্দদাস কহে মোহে হেরি রোই ॥

11. Different readings in regard to the song—শুন বহু বল্লভ
কান.....

(a) (ক) শ্রীগাক্ষার—Vaishnavapadalahari, Padakalpataru.
(Parishad and Battalā).

(খ) বরাড়ী—C. U. MS. No. 324, C. U. MS. No. 305
and Padāmritasamudra.

(গ) স্নহই—Parisad MS. No. 953.

(b) (ক) ভালে তুহঁ রসিক স্নজান—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

(খ) ভালে তুহঁ চতুর স্নজান—Padāmritasamudra and
Parishad MS. No. 953.

(গ) তুহু বড়ি চতুর স্নজান—C.U. MS. No. 305 and
C. U. MS. No. 324.

(c) (ক) দেখি তুয়া এসব কাজ—Vaishnavapadalahari,
and Padakalpataru.

(খ) শুনইতে ঐহন কাজে—Padāmritasamudra, C.U.
MS. No. 324, Parishad MS. No. 953 and
C. U. MS. No. 305

(d) (ক) পায়রি পিরীত উপেখি—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) পামরী পিরীত উপেখি—C. U. MSS. No. 324 and
305. Padakalpataru and Padāmritasamudra.

(গ) পামর পিরীতি উপেখি—Parishad MS. No. 953.

The word 'পায়রি' is meaningless. It should be 'পামরী'
or 'পামর.'

(e) (ক) যো পদ পরশক আশে—Vaishnavapadalahari,
Padakalpataru.

(খ) যো পদ পঙ্কজ পরশক আশে—C. U. MS. No. 324.

(গ) যো পদ যুগ পরশন আশে—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(ঘ) যো পদ পঙ্কজ আশে—Parishad MS. No. 953.

(f) (ক) করসি কতহুঁ অভিলাষে—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) কতনা করলি অভিলাষে—Parishad MS. No. 953 and
C. U. MS. No. 324.

(g) (ক) কৈছে রহলি মুখ মোড়ি—Padakalpataru,
Vaishnavapadalahari, and C. U. MS. No. 324

(খ) কাহে আওলি মুখ মোড়ি—C. U. MS. No. 305.

(গ) কাহে রহি মুখ মোড়ি—Parishad MS. No. 953.

(h) (ক) বাক হৃদয়ে বত সাধে—Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) বাহাতে হৃদয়ে এত সাধে—C. U. MS. No. 324,
Padakalpataru and C. U. MS. No. 305.

শ্রীগান্ধার

শুন বহু-বল্লভ কান ।
 ভালে তুহুঁ রসিক সৃজান ॥
 পামর পিরীতি উপেখি ।
 আয়লুঁ কুলবতী দেখি ॥
 তোহারি রসিক-পণ জানি ।
 কহইতে আওলুঁ বাণী ॥
 দেখি তুয়া এসব কাজ ।
 হাসব যুবতী-সমাজ ॥
 যো পদ পরশক আশে ।
 করসি কতহুঁ অভিলাষে ॥
 সো পদ-পঙ্কজ ছোড়ি ।
 কৈছে রহলি মুখ মোড়ি ॥
 কোন শিখায়লি নীতে ।
 ধিক ধিক তোহারি পিরীতে ॥
 ছিয়ে ছিয়ে বিদগধী রাধে ।
 যাক হৃদয়ে এত সাধে ॥
 গোবিন্দদাস মতি মন্দ ।
 হেরইতে ভৈগেল ধন্দ ॥

12. Different readings in regard to the song—"রাধাবদন
চাঁদ হেরি তুলল....."

(a) (ক) ছন্দ বন্ধ বিনু পলায়ত ধবলী
বাছুরা কোরহুঁ কোর ॥

C. U. MS. No. 303.

(খ) ছন্দ বন্দ বিনু ধবলী ধাপ্ত
বাছুরী কোরে আগোর ॥

Padakalpataru.

- (গ) ছন্দ বন্ধ বিনা ধবলী দোহত
বাছিয়া কোরহি কোর ॥
Vaishnavapadalahari.

(b) (ক) শূন দেহত মুগধ মুরারি ।—Vaishnavapadalahari
and C. U MS. No. 303.

(খ) শূনহি দোহত মুগধ মুরারি ।—Padakalpataru.

The version 'শূন দেহত মুগধ মুরারি' is not at all sensible here. The word 'দেহত' should be 'দোহত.' Otherwise it would carry no sense at all. True fact is, Krishna was so much absorbed in the thought of Rādhā, while he was milking his cow, that the cow fled away without his knowledge. Krishna was so much out of himself at that time that he could not perceive this fact and began to milk in the air (শূনহি দোহত). The version 'শূন দেহত' has got no sense at all.

(c) (ক) মিছাই হাথ করত গতাগতি—C. U. MS. No. 303.

(খ) বুটাই অঙ্গুলি করত গতাগতি—Vaishnavapadalahari
and Padakalpataru.

(d) (ক) ধবলী ভরমে ধবল পদ ছান্দই
—Vaishnavapadalahari and C. U. MS. No. 303.

(খ) ধবলীক ভরমে ধবল পায়ে ছান্দল
—Padakalpataru.

(e) (ক) গোবিন্দদাস মন ভোর—C. U. MS. No. 303 and
Vaishnavapadalahari.

(খ) গোবিন্দদাস পছঁ হেরি ভোর—Padakalpataru.

তথ্যরাগ

রাধাবদন-চাঁদ হেরি ভুলল
শ্যামর নয়ন-চকোর ।
ছন্দ বন্ধ বিনু ধবলী ধাত
বাছুরী কোরে আগোর ॥

শূনহি দোহত মুগধ মুরারি ।
 ঝুটহি অঙ্গুলি করত গতাগতি
 হেরি হসত ব্রজনারী ॥
 লাজহিঁ লাজ হাসি দিঠি কুঞ্চিত
 পুন লেই ছান্দন-ডোর ।
 ধবলীক ভরমে ধবল পায়ে ছান্দল
 গোবিন্দদাস হেরি ভোর ॥

13. Different readings in regard to the song—তনু তনু
 মিলল উপজল প্রেম.....

(a) (ক) মরকত যৈছন বেঢ়ল হেম—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahrī.

(খ) মরকতে যৈছন জ্বলতহি হেম—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahrī.

(b) (ক) কনক লতায়ৈ জন্ম তরুণ তমাল—Padakalpataru
 and Vaishnavapadalahrī.

(খ) কনক লতাবলী তরুণ তমাল—C. U. MS. No. 303.

Of the above two versions we prefer the version (ক).

(c) (ক) কমলে মধুপ জন্ম পায়ল সঙ্গ—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahrī.

(খ) কোমল মধুপ যেন পায়ল সঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

We prefer the version (ক). The expression 'কোমল' has
 got no significance here.


(d) (ক) ছহঁ তনু পুলকিত প্রেম তরঙ্গ—Padakalpataru and
 Vaishnavapadalahrī.

(খ) ছহঁ তনু পূরল মদন তরঙ্গ—C. U. MS. No. 303.

- (e) (ক) গোবিন্দদাস দুহঁক গুণ গান ॥—Padakalpataru and
Vaishnavapadalahari.
(খ) গোবিন্দদাস পহঁ দুহঁ স্নজান ॥—C. U. MS. No. 303.

ভাটিয়ারি

তনু তনু মিলল উপজল প্রেম ।
মরকত বৈছন বেঢ়ল হেম ॥
কনক লতায় জন্ম তরুণ তমাল ।
নব জলধরে জন্ম বিজুরী রসাল ॥
কমলে মধুপ যেন পাওল সঙ্গ ।
দুহঁ তনু পুলকিত প্রেম-তরঙ্গ ॥
দুহঁ অধরামৃত দুহঁ করু পান ।
গোবিন্দদাস দুহঁক গুণ-গান ॥



THE GĪLAKĪ DIALECT

By

M. ISHAQUE, M.A., B.Sc.,

*Lecturer in the Department of Arabic and Persian,
Calcutta University.*

Introduction.

Prior to my journey to Persia I was under the impression that although dialects were many, there was only one language spoken throughout Persia, but my tour proved that the fact was otherwise. Every province has got a distinct dialect of its own—sometimes there are more than one in the same district, and often a local dialect is so different from standard Persian as to merit the name of a language. Frequently we find the townsmen have largely adopted the standard speech with slight local modifications, but the country-side round about is still conservative and sticks to the pure form of the old dialect or language : thus bringing about a marked difference between city and vulgar speech throughout the whole of Persia generally. (This is happening in North India too : the city people are speaking more and more better Hindusthani—Urdu or Hindi—but the country-side round about, say Agra and Lucknow, Allahabad and Benares, and Patna, still preserve the old dialects.) I might mention a few dialects, the peculiarities of which I observed in some parts of Persia during my sojourn :—

1. Sabzawār has its own dialect called Sabzawārī, which for a common observer is a bit difficult to distinguish.

2. Semnān has a special dialect called Semnānī.¹ The peculiarity of this dialect is that it is said to contain words of classical Greek origin. This is due to the fact that the Greeks had colonised in a town Hecatompylus, out of which the present Semnān has developed.

3. The dialect of Māzandarān² like Gīlakī has its independent existence and is spoken throughout Māzandarān.

4. The Tālīsh dialect is spoken in Tālīsh and its surroundings. This dialect is also somewhat akin to Gīlakī.

5. Gīlakī³ is the dialect spoken in preference to Persian at Rasht, Bandar Pahlavi, Lahijan and the villages situated on the bank of the Safid Rud.

6. Shemīrānī dialect is prevalent amongst the mountainous people of the Albruz.

7. The Persian Zoroastrians of Yazd have a dialect of their own. It is called *Darī*.

8. Kirmānī dialect is spoken in Kirmān and its neighbourhood.

9. Tibsī dialect is prevalent in Tibs and Bushariya.

10. There was a dialect in Azerbaijan, now it is spoken only in a village near Tabriz. It is known by the name of Harand.

Besides these speeches which are generally described as *dialects* of Persia, there are other *languages* spoken within the frontiers of Persia. Kurdish is an important Iranian language, a sister-speech of Persian, and this is spoken by a good many tribes in Western Persia. But the Kurds who are Persian subjects invariably learn and use Persian. There are some Turki speakers, and some Arabs also besides Beluchis, who are Iranians just like the Kurds and the Persians proper.

It will require a number of specialists to study properly these dialects and find out their relationship among themselves and

¹ Vide Semnān Dialect, by Houtum-Schindler, Vol. XXXII, Z.D.M.G., 1878, pp. 585-541.

^{2, 3} Vide Essai sur les dialects de Mazanderan et Gilan, by G. Melgounof, Vol. XXII, Z.D.M.G., 1868, pp. 195-224.

with Standard Persian. That should be the business of the Persian people mainly, and when the new University is established at Tehran, I am sure Persian research students will take up this great work of linguistic survey of Persia as a preliminary to the writing of a detailed philology of the Iranian speech.

At Rasht I studied the Gīlakī dialect which is quite an interesting speech. I am giving a short account of it together with some texts I received, largely by the courtesy of Mr. Kesmāī who is quite an accomplished poet in this dialect. In Geiger's *Grundriss* some account of Gīlakī along with other dialects has been given ; still I hope the present study will be interesting to English readers, if only for the texts in both prose and verse. I give my notes as an independent study of the speech.

The Gīlakī dialect or the language now spoken in Gīlān is a branch of the Iranian family. The people of Gīlān were the last to adopt Islam ; they were comparatively isolated. Their dialect went on changing gradually, but till recently it was not much exposed to Arabic influences. Arabic words in plenty has crept into it through Standard Persian. Still a great many pure Iranian forms and words are preserved in Gīlakī which one does not find in Standard Persian. The local people are quite proud of their dialect, and they always speak it at home, even the highly cultured among them. It is, however, a great pity that no serious book has as yet been published in Gīlakī, although a few Gīlkaī poems have appeared in Arabic characters. Besides, popular poems are current among the people which are waiting to be written down and collected. There is a movement now at Rasht itself to bring the language to life again, giving it some literary prestige. Mr. Kesmāī, a veteran poet in Gīlakī and other young writers are composing poems in Gīlakī and publishing them in Arabic characters. Till now no prose has appeared, and there is no newspaper in it. The children learn at school only Persian. A competent scholar should compile a good grammar and a dictionary of this interesting speech. I utilised my short stay at Rasht for preparing a little book of Gīlakī grammar.

The account of the dialect in Geiger or in any other book was then not within my reach.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

1. The signs of the Infinitive are :—

- (a) دَن (dan); as : کُودَن (kūdan) = To do.
- (b) تَن (tan); as : نِشْتَن (nishlan) = To sit.
- (c) اِن (en); as : زِاِن (ze-en) = To beat.
- (d) اَن (ān); as : اَوَنان (ūnān) = To put.
- (e) وَن (ūn); as : شَوَن (shu-ūn) = To go.

2. الف (alif) is suffixed to a noun for vocative case as in Persian; as : کَلَا (kelekā) = O girl!

3. There is no distinction of gender in pronouns, verbs and adjectives, precisely as is the case with Persian.

4. Prepositions are postpositions; as :

اِسْتِکَانَ مِیَان (istikān-i-miyān) = In the cup.

5. مضاف الیه (muzāf ilaih), i.e., possessives are used before مضاف (muzāf), i.e., nouns possessed and a کَسْرَه (kasreh) is given to the last letter of the مضاف الیه (muzāf-ilaih), i.e., possessives, provided that it is a noun ending in consonant ; as :

پَرَوِزِ پَر (Parvīz-i-per) = Parviz's father.

If the noun ends in a vowel, no کَسْرَه (kasreh) is given.

6. Diminutive is formed by suffixing ک (kāf) to a noun as in Persian but it is very commonly used in Gilakī.

7. Adjectives are used before the nouns qualified ; as :

8. As in Sanskrit, words mostly end in the vowel ـ (*fatḥeh*) pronounced as *eh*. * (*ha*) is added to such words so that the ـ (*fatḥeh*) may be distinctly pronounced; as :

خومۀ (*khūmeh*) = Nest.

مرغانۀ (*Murghāneh*) = Egg.

سرفۀ (*Surfeh*) = Cough.

9. The Plural of nouns is formed by the addition of ان (*ān*) ; as :

جکل (*jakal*) = Child. جکلان (*jakālān*) = Children.

10. The cardinal numbers excepting number one which is ایتا (*Itā*) are similar to those of Persian, only تا (*tā*) being suffixed to every Persian number ; as :

دوتا (*du tā*) = Two ;

سه تا (*seh tā*) = Three ;

چار تا (*char tā*) = Four ;

and so on.

PRONOUNS.

Nominative.

	Singular.		Plural.	
	Gilakī.	Persian.	Gilakī.	Persian.
First Person ...	من or من	من <i>Man</i>	آما	ما <i>Mā</i>
Second Person ...	تو	تو <i>Tu</i>	شما	شما <i>Shumā</i>
Third Person ...	اون	* <i>Un</i> او	ايشان	ايشان <i>Ū-shān</i>
				They

* Its Persian form is او and is only used as demonstrative adjective for distance, whereas in Gilakī it is used both as demonstrative adjective and demonstrative pronoun.

*Possessive.**

Singular.			Plural.		
Gīlakī.			Gīlakī.		
First Person	... می	<i>Mi</i> My	أمة	<i>Ameh</i>	Our
Second Person	... تی	<i>Ti</i> Thy	شمة	<i>Shimeh</i>	Yours
Third Person	... اونی	<i>Uni</i> His or her	أوشانه	<i>Ushēneh</i>	Their

* The Persian form is not mentioned here because the Nominative forms are used with kasreh (ـ) of Izāfat to the last letter of the nouns possessed. This may be due to the influence of the Arabic language over the Persian, as in Arabic Possessives (مضاف الیه) always follow the nouns possessed (مضاف). In Gīlakī just like English or French the possessive pronouns are used before the nouns possessed, which rule is observed in old Persian. Also it may be noticed that in Gīlakī the possessive pronouns ending in ی (i) in the singular and * ـه (eh) in the plural very well suggest to be the older form of the possessive kasreh — applied to the last letter of the noun possessed preceding the possessive. Kasreh is given to the last letter of the possessive and not of the noun possessed, viz., پرویز پر (Parvīz-i-per), i.e., Parviz's father.

Objective.

	Singular.			Plural.	
	Gilakī.	Persian.		Gilakī.	Persian.
First Person ...	مِرا <i>Merū</i>	مِرا <i>Marū</i>	Me	اَمِه را <i>Amehrū</i>	مِرا <i>Mū-rū</i>
Second Person ...	تِرا <i>Terū</i>	تِرا <i>Turū</i>	Thee	شِمِه را <i>Shumeh-rū</i>	شِمارا <i>Shumā-rū</i>
Third Person ...	اُونِ <i>Unū</i>	اُونِ <i>Urū</i>	Him, her or it	اُوشانِه را <i>Ushaneh-rū</i>	اُوشانِ <i>Ushān-ra</i>

Oblique.

First Person ...	چِمِه <i>* Jemeh</i>	از مِمن <i>Az man</i>	From me	چِمِه اَمِه <i>Je-ameh</i>	از ما <i>Az mā</i>	From us
Second Person ...	چِمِه <i>Je-teh</i>	از تُو <i>Az tu</i>	From thee	چِمِه شِمِه <i>Je-shumeh</i>	از شما <i>Az shamā</i>	From you
Third Person ...	چِمِه <i>Je-klū</i>	از اِن <i>Az ū</i>	From him, her or it	چِمِه خُوشانِه <i>Je-klūshūneh</i>	از اُوشانِ <i>Az ushān</i>	From them

* چِمِه (Je) or چِمِه (Jeh) means از (Az), i.e., from; as : چِمِه اُوشانِه (Jemeh uūpursch) meaning he may ask (from) me.

Reflexive.

Singular.		Plural.	
Gilakī.	Persian.	Gilakī.	Persian.
First Person ... من مَرِهْ	من خُودم	أما امرء	ما خُود مارن
	<i>Man mereh</i>	<i>Amā amereh</i>	<i>Ma khūd-i-mān</i>
Second Person ... تَو تَرِهْ	تو خُودت	شما شَمَرِهْ	شما خُود تان
	<i>Tu tereh</i>	<i>Shama Shamereh</i>	<i>Shumā khūdātān</i>
Third Person ... اَدَن خُورِهْ	او خُودش	اوشان خُوشَانَرِهْ	اوشان خُود شان
	<i>Ān khāreḥ</i>	<i>Ūshan khūshanereh</i>	<i>Ūshan khūd-i-shān</i>
			Themselves

Interrogative.

Gilakī.	Persian.
کِی	<i>Keh</i> Who

Demonstrative Adjective.

Singular.		Plural.	
Gilakī.	Persian.	Gilakī.	Persian.
For nearness ... اَن	<i>An</i> In This	ايشان	<i>Īshān</i> These
For distance ... اُن	<i>Ān</i> An That	اوشان	<i>Ūshān</i> Those

VERBS (افعال).

Conjugation (گردان).

Verb ' شَوْن ' , i.e., to go.

Past Indefinite (ماضي مطلق).

Singular.			Plural.		
First Person	...	بشوم	Bishūm	بشيمى	We went
Second Person	...	بشى	Bishī	بشيدى	You went
Third Person	...	بشو	Bishū	بشيدى	They went

Recent Past, * i.e., Present Perfect (ماضي قريب).

First Person	...	کړا شوي	Karā shūmī	کړا شوي	We have gone
Second Person	...	کړا شوي	Karā shū	کړا شوي	You have gone
Third Person	...	کړا شوي	Karā shū	کړا شوي	They have gone
gone					

* According to Arab Grammarians the Present Perfect Tense is a sub-division of the Past Tense and is termed ماضي قريب (Māzī Karīb), i.e., Recent Past.

Past Perfect (ماضي بعید).

Singular.

First Person ...	بشور برم	<i>Bishū būm</i>	I had gone	بشه بيم	<i>Bishēh bīm</i>	We had gone
Second Person ...	بشه بي	<i>Bishēh bī</i>	Thou hadst gone	بشه بيد	<i>Bishēh bīd</i>	You had gone
Third Person ...	بشه بر	<i>Bishēh bū</i>	He or she had gone	بشه بيد	<i>Bishēh bīd</i>	They had gone

Plural.

Past Continuous (ماضي استمراري).

First Person ...	شون در برم	<i>Shū-ūn dā būm</i>	I was going	شون دی بيم	<i>Shū-ūn dā bīm</i>	We were going
Second Person ...	شون دی بي	<i>Shū-ūn dā bī</i>	Thou wast going	شون دی بيد	<i>Shū-ūn dā bīd</i>	You were going
Third Person ...	شون در بر	<i>Shū-ūn dā bū</i>	He or she was going	شون دي بيد	<i>Shū-ūn dā bīd</i>	They were going

Dubious Past (ماضي احتمالي).


Singular.		Plural.	
First Person ...	اگر بشو یم <i>Agar bishū bīm</i>	اگر بشو یدیم <i>Agar bishū bīm</i>	If we went
Second Person ...	اگر بشو بی <i>Agar bishūh bī</i>	اگر بشو یدید <i>Agar bishū bīd</i>	If you went
Third Person ...	اگر بشو بی <i>Agar bishūh bī</i>	اگر بشو یدید <i>Agar bishū bīd</i>	If they went

Aorist (مضارع).

First Person ...	شیم <i>Shim</i>	We go
Second Person ...	شی <i>Shī</i>	You go
Third Person ...	شید <i>Shēh</i>	They go

Future (مستقبل).

	Singular.	Plural.	
First Person ...	خایم شون <u>Khāyem shun</u>	خایمی شون <u>Khāyimī shun</u>	We shall go
Second Person ...	خای شون <u>Khāyī shun</u>	خاییدی شون <u>Khāyīdī shun</u>	You will go
Third Person ...	خایه شون <u>Khāyeh shun</u>	خاییدی شون <u>Khāyīdī shun</u>	They will go



VOCABULARY

NOUNS.

Gīlakī.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
پَر	پدر	Father	Melgounof spells it as پیدر (<i>Peer</i>).
مار	مادر	Mother	
برادر	برادر	Brother	
خاور	خواهر	Sister	Melgounof spells it as خاور (<i>Hahūr</i>).
زنای	زن	Woman	
مردای	مرد	Man	
پنچا	گربه	Cat	
پُرد	پُل	Bridge	
گب	حرف	Gossip	
لبس	رخت	Dress	It is an Arabic word crept into Gīlakī.
آب	آب	Water	
چهنی	کنجشک	Sparrow	
گیس	موی سر	Tresses	In Sanskrit we have केश (<i>Kaish</i>).

NOUNS—Contd.

Gīlakī.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
جا	محل	Place	
خوس	سرفه	Cough	
چم	خزه	Moss	
ره	پسرك	Small boy	
بلك مكر	دخترک	Small girl	
چقل	بچه	Child	
بج	برنج	Rice	Melgounof spells it as بج (Betch).
مچه	زنخ	Chin	
رو	رخ	Countenance	
دیم	صورت	Face	
ارانه	غلب	Double chin	
چشما	چشم	Eye	
دار	درخت	Tree	

NOUNS—Contd.

Gilaki.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
کونه	بونه	Shrub	
خومه	آشیانه	Nest	
مرغانه	تخم مرغ	Egg	
ناؤ	کرجی کوچک	Canoe	
سو	روشنایی	Light	
داز	شکاف	Hole	
ناخوشی	مرض	Illness	
جان ساقی	تندرستی	Good health	
درچوک	میوه که از پوست جدا نمیشود	A fruit from which the skin cannot be separated.	
کلپتری	حرف مزخرف	Nonsense	
کار	شغل	Work	
در	پهلوی	Side	
فاندر فندر	جستجو	Search	

NOUNS—Contd.

Gilaki.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
رَایس فیرس	<i>Wāpurs-fapurs</i>	تحقیق	Investigation
زنک	<i>Wang</i>	گریه	Weeping
خنده	<i>Khandeh</i>	خنده	Laughing
تم تزل بزه	<i>Tam-tāl-bezh</i>	سکوت معض	Perfect silence
کوجزلی	<i>Kūchzai</i>	بچه کرچک	Baby
گار	<i>Gāz</i>	دندان	Tooth
پالو	<i>Pālū</i>	پهل	Side
پاتن	<i>Pātan</i>	کفپا	Sole of foot
مانده	<i>Māndeh</i>	گوساله	Calf
گامش	<i>Gāmish</i>	گرمیش	Buffalo
خورکا	<i>Khūrka</i>	خار پشت	Hedgehog
لاک پشت	<i>Lāk-pusht</i>	سنگ پشت	Tortoise
سبزل	<i>Subūl</i>	کک	Flea
کلم	<i>Kelem</i>	کرم	Worm
چیچیره مار	<i>Chīchīrehmār</i>	سوسمار	Lizard

NOUNS—*Contd.*

Gilakī.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
لنتی <i>Lenti</i>	مار	Serpent	
مردار <i>Murdān</i>	مرداب	Lake	
شه <i>Sheh</i>	مه	Fog	
جاف <i>Jaf</i>	جو	Barley	
مرس <i>Mers</i>	مس	Copper	
توسان <i>Tavistān</i>	تابستان	Summer	
هست <i>Hest</i>	مرطوب	Damp	

ADJECTIVES.		Meaning.	REMARKS.
Gilaki.	Persian.		
خورم <i>Khūrūm</i>	خوب <i>Khūb</i>	Excellent	
پُر <i>Pūr</i>	پُر <i>Par</i>	Full	
موس برون <i>Mūs-bikūdeh</i>	پوسیده <i>Pūsīdeh</i>	Rotten	
شندره <i>Shendreh</i>	پارو پارو <i>Pāreh pāreh</i>	In fragments	
هر <i>Hū</i>	خائف <i>Khāif</i>	Afraid	
اب چکفنه <i>Ab-jekufteh</i>	آب افتاده <i>Āb-uftādeh</i>	Stagnant (water)	
قشنگ <i>Kashang</i>	خوشگل <i>Khūshgil</i>	Pretty	
بُتک <i>Buchak</i>	چمباتمه نشسته <i>Chambātmeh nishasteh</i>	Squatting	
میچ میله <i>Mich-mīleh</i>	بی‌مردی <i>Bihūdeh</i>	Unmannerly	
سر <i>Ser</i>	میر <i>Sīr</i>	Satiated	
دیشتا <i>Pishtā</i>	گرسنه <i>Gurisneh</i>	Hungry	
فگردسته <i>Fagurdasteh</i>	به پشت افتاده <i>Bi-pusht uftādeh</i>	Fallen on the back	
راگردسته <i>Wāgurdasteh</i>	پُرافتاده <i>Birū uftādeh</i>	Fallen facing downwards.	

VERBS.		Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
Gilaki.				
آمرن	<i>Āmun</i>	آمدن	Come	
شرن	<i>Shu-un</i>	رفتن	Go	
نشتن	<i>Nishtan</i>	نشستن	Sit	
خفتن	<i>Khufan</i>	خوابیدن	Sleep	
رشتن	<i>Virishtan</i>	برخاستن	Rise	
کردن	<i>Kūdan</i>	کردن	Do	
دوختن	<i>Dūkhūdan</i>	صدا کردن	Shout	
آوسدن	<i>Usūdān</i>	برداشتن	Raise	
راشدن	<i>Wāshūdan</i>	حرکت دادن	Move	
راخوردن	<i>Wākhūdan</i>	نوشیدن	Drink	
خریدن	<i>Khūdan</i>	خوردن	Eat	
چیدریدن	<i>Jivishtan</i>	گریختن	Flee	
رادان	<i>Wādān</i>	رَل کردن	Abandon	
رافرشتن	<i>Wākūshān</i>	آب از چاه برداشتن	Draw water from the well.	

VERBS—Contd.

Gilaki.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
راگردستن <i>Wāگردستان</i>	بر گشتن <i>Bar-gashtan</i>	Return	
نگوگردستن <i>Fagurdastan</i>	بر پشت خرابیدن <i>Bar pusht khwābīdan</i>	Sleep on the back	
ایستن <i>Īsān</i>	ایستادن <i>Īstādan</i>	Stand	Cf. Anglo-Saxon Standan.
فاندیرستن <i>Fāndīristan</i>	نگاه کردن <i>Nīgāh kardan</i>	Gaze	
جھفتن <i>Juhuftan</i>	پنهان شدن <i>Pinhān shudan</i>	To be hidden	
زبان <i>Ze-en</i>	زدن <i>Zadan</i>	Beat	
بوستن یا بُکُون <i>Būstan or Bu-un</i>	بودن <i>Būdan</i>	Be	
کوکون <i>Dukūdan</i>	پوشیدن <i>Pūshīdan</i>	Hide	
ایشکن <i>Ishkenen</i>	شکستن <i>Shikastan</i>	Break	
فارسن <i>Fārisen</i>	رسیدن <i>Rasīdan</i>	Reach	
دگفتن <i>Dakaftan</i>	افتادن <i>Uftādan</i>	Fall	
راپرسن <i>Wāpursan</i>	پرسیدن <i>Pursīdan</i>	Ask	

VERBS—Contd.

Gilaki.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
هین <i>He-en</i>	خریدن <i>Kharidan</i>	Buy	
دین <i>De-en</i>	دیدن <i>Dīdan</i>	See	
دپرکستن <i>Daparkastan</i>	غلقتن از خواب بر خاستن <i>Ghaṣlatan az khwāb bar-khāstan</i>	Somnambulate	
بسر نا آن <i>Basarmān</i>	اضافه کردن <i>Idāfeh kardan</i>	Add to	
جیگفتن <i>Jīguttan</i>	کم کردن <i>Kam kardan</i>	Diminish	
راپروستن <i>Wāparbūstan</i>	گم شدن <i>Gum shudan</i>	To be lost	
پیدا کردن <i>Paidā kūdan</i>	پیدا کردن <i>Pāida kardan</i>	Find out	
دپرشتن <i>Daparashṭan</i>	تکیه دادن <i>Takiyeh dādan</i>	Support	
بوین <i>Būben</i>	سوزن نخ کردن <i>Sūzan nakh kardan</i>	Thread the needles	
دکاستن <i>Dakolastan</i>	ناگهان ریختن <i>Nāgahān rīkhtan</i>	Fall suddenly	
فکون <i>Fakūdan</i>	ریختن <i>Rīkhtan</i>	Pour	
برکشتن <i>Barkashtan</i>	وارفته شدن <i>Wārūneh shudan</i>	Capsize	
اوان <i>Unān</i>	گذاشتن <i>Guzāshṭan</i>	Put	

VERBS—*Contd.*

Gilaki.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
جلهستن <i>Jalahastan</i>	آريزان شدن	Hang	Mostly by means of hand.
دلهستن <i>Dalahastan</i>	آريزان شدن	Hang	
ايسه يا يه <i>Iseh or Yeh</i>	است	Is	
ننه <i>Naneh</i>	نيست	Is not	

ADVERBS (صفات فعل).

Gilakī.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
آكه	<i>Akeh</i>	كی	When
حسه	<i>Hasah</i>	حالا	Now
اوقتان	<i>U-waktān</i>	آنوقتہا	At that time
بی	<i>Bī</i>	بدون	Without
کویه	<i>Kūyeh</i>	کجا	Where
ایہ	<i>Ayeh</i>	اینجا	Here
اویا	<i>Ūyā</i>	آنجا	There
اوریہ	<i>Ūrah</i>	آنطرف	That side
اۋہ	<i>Arah</i>	اینطرف	This side
چی	<i>Chī</i>	چه	What
هرچی	<i>Harchī</i>	هرچه	Whatever

Adverbial phrases.

Gilaki.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
هجر	همین جور	In this way	
آن مالمسته	مانند این	Like this	
بچه بچه	کم کم	Little by little	
شبگئی	در تاریکی شب	In the darkness of night.	
وسه	بس	Enough	
	Wasteh		

PREPOSITIONS.¹

Gilaki.	Persian.	Meaning.	REMARKS.
بوجور	Bālā	Above	
جیر	Zir	Below	
میان	Andar	Inside	
جه	Az	From	
پسے	Pas	Behind	Cf. Pahlevi (Pās).
اما	Amā	But	
جلو	Pish	Before	

¹ In Gilaki Prepositions are actually, Postpositions. They are used after their objects.

SENTENCES.

Gilaki.		Meaning.
آ کلا خایم	<i>A kulā khāyem</i>	I want this cap.
استکان میان قند دگرون	<i>Istikān-i-miyan kand dukūn</i>	Put sugar in the cup.
میرا رالاندی	<i>Merū wālānīdī</i>	They suspend me.
آ کارا ران	<i>A kār rū wākan</i>	Do this work.
آرنه دوغان	<i>Ūneh dūghān</i>	Call him.
بشو	<i>Bishū</i>	Go.
نَشْرُو	<i>Nashū</i>	Don't go.
بِنِش	<i>Binish</i>	Sit down.
نَش	<i>Na-nish</i>	Don't sit.
مورخفتو بوم کی شما بشه بید	<i>Mū khaftū būm kī shumā bishēh bīd</i>	I was asleep when you had gone away.
تی نام چی یه ؟	<i>Tī nām chī yeh ?</i>	What is your name ?
کویه خالی بهی ؟	<i>Kūyeh khālī bishī ?</i>	Where dost thou wish to go ?
جه کویه بامروئی ؟	<i>Jeh kūyeh bāmūi ?</i>	From where comest thou ?
شما آ کلا بامروئیدی ؟	<i>Shamā akeh bāmūīdī ?</i>	When did you come ?

SENTENCES—Contd.

Gilakī.	Meaning.
ایتا کتاب مرا فاده	Give me a book.
تو پول داری ؟	Hast thou money ?
تی وطن کویچه ایسه ؟	Where is thy native land ?
تی خانه کویچه ایسه ؟	Where is thy residence ?
مو خایم آکارا بکن	I want you to do this work.
مو خایم آکار بیبه	I want this work to be done.
هجر نبه	It will not be so.
مورفردا پولو خوروم	To-morrow I will take <i>Pulan</i> . ¹
آ خانه خوب ایسه	This house is good.

¹ It is a Persian dish prepared with rice, clarified butter and some spices.

Maxims.

Gīlakī.

خانی تی قبر بیدینی تی همسایه قبر بدین
Khān tī kabr bīdīnī tī kamsāyeh kabr bīdīn

خاور گچه برارک شیلہ

Khākhūr gācheh barārek shīleh

Meaning.

If thou wishest to see thy tomb, see
 the tomb of thy neighbour;
i.e., take lessons from others in
 trouble.

If sister has done wrong brother is in
 fault too;
i.e., it requires two to make a quarrel.

A Specimen of Gilakī Poetry.

Meaning.

Gilakī.

من بدم دكفتم تا بديم تى زلفانه سيا چومه

I fell into a trap when I saw thy tresses, O Black-eyed (sweet-heart)!

Man bi dām dukaftam tā bi dām tī zulfāneh, Siyā Chūmeh!

تى موگريا كمند رستم دستانه سيا چومه

Thy hair (is) as though the lasso of Rustam, O Black-eyed (sweet-heart)!

Tī mū gūyā kamand-i-Rustam dastāneh, Siyā Chūmeh!

اشهد بگفتم ربيستم حيرانه سيا چومه

“I bear witness!” uttered I and became confounded, O Black-eyed (sweet-heart)!

Ash-had¹ bi guftam u bibistam hayrāneh, Siyā Chūmeh!

چون بدم زنگى با تير و كمانه سيا چومه

As if I saw a negro with arrow and bow, O Black-eyed (sweet-heart)!

Chūn bi-dam zangī bā tīr u kamāneh, Siyā Chūmeh!

¹ It is an abridged form of the formula of the confession of faith in Islam which runs as ^{أشهد أن لا إله إلا الله} (Ash-hadu an-lā-ilāha ill-Allāh). I bear witness that nothing deserves to be worshipped but Allah. It is sometimes, as here, used as an Interjection seeking help of Allah when confounded.

Gilakī.

ایتا باغبان بو، ایتا باغ داشتی، ای روز با صو خو باغه سرکشی بوکونه، بیده ایتا مردکه انه درون نیشته کرا انه پیازنه، ایتا ایتا کندن دره ایتا سفرم اوشنقرا پهنا کوده ایپازنه درکونه او سفره میان، باغبان بوگوفته ”مردکه دزدی بآه اشکاری به؟ تو چره می پیازه کندان دری؟“ دزده بوگوفته ”والله کبلائی من تقصیر نارم از ارشون دربوم باد زیادی دربو باد مرا بده تاوناتی باغه درون من بیدم چی بوکونم باد مرا بدیره دیوار نونه بی نیشتم بی گيفتم ایپازنه قایم بداشتم باد از بسکه زبان بو پیازا بکنده مرا با پیاز تاون اوشنقر من ایتا پیازنه دیگر بی گيفتم هونم باد بکنده هتو هتو اه پیازنه همه باد بکنده“ باغبان از دروغگوئی اه دزد تعجب بوکوده بوگوفته ”خاب مردای ان درست ایپازنه باد بکنده اما آشنه اه سفره میان کی درکوده“ هنم باده کاره؟“ دزده را بمانسته بوگوفته والله اه فکر کردان دربوم کی انا اه سفره میان که درکوده.“

A STORY IN GĪLAKĪ.

Translation.

Ītā bāghbān bū. Ītā bāgh dāsh̄tī. Ī rūz bāmū khū bāgha sarkash̄ būkūneh. Bīdeh ītā mardakeh anek durūn nīsh̄teh kirā ana pīyāzaneh, ītā ītā kandan dareh ītā sufram ūsh̄antarā pahnā kūdeh a pīyāzānā dūkūneh ū sufreh miān. Bāghbān būgūfteh, “Mardakeh dūzdi be-ah ash̄kāri beh? Tū charah mī pīyāzeh kandān dari?”
Dūzdah būgūfteh, “Wallāh Kablāi man taks̄ir nāram az arāsh̄hūn dūbūm bād ziādī dūbū bād marā bireh tāudātī bāgheh durūn man bīdam chī būkūnam bād marā bidareh dūwār nazaneh bīnīsh̄tam bīgīftam a pīyāzīh kaim bīdōsh̄tam, bād az baskeh ziyād bū pīyāzeh bikandeh marā bā pīyāz tāudā ūsh̄antar, man ītā pīyāzeh dīgar bīgīftam hūnam bād bikandeh, hatū hatū pīyāzaneh hameh bād kandeh.” Bāghbān az durūghgū-i-ah dūzd t’ajjub būkūdeh būgūfteh, “Khāb mardāi an dūrūst a pīyāzane bād bikandeh, ammā ush̄aneh ah sufreh miān kī dūkūdek, hanam bādeh kārah?” Dūzdeh wā bimānisteh būgūfteh, “Wallāh ah fikrā kūdān dūbūm kī anā ah sufreh miān kih dūkūdeh.”

Translation.

(Once there) was a gardener. (He) had a garden. One day (he) came to his garden to supervise. (He) found a man sitting in his garden where onions were cultivated, (who) was digging out onions one by one and putting them in his table cloth spread close by. The gardener said, “O man, can theft be more manifest than this? Why do you dig out my onions?” The thief said, “Upon Allah! Kablai,¹ I have no fault; I was walking along when a strong wind began to blow and threw me out of the way into the garden. I was (just) thinking what to do that the wind may not dash me against (any) door and wall. I sat down and firmly caught hold of an onion plant. As the wind was too strong it pushed me aside with the plant rooted out (in my hand). I caught hold of another plant. The wind rooted out that one too. In this way the wind rooted out all the onions.” Being astonished at this falsehood of the thief the gardener said, “Well, O man, right you are; the wind rooted out these onions, but who put the onions in the table cloth? Is this also the action of the wind?” The thief laughed and said, “Upon Allah, I was myself lost in this thought as to who had put them in this table cloth.”

¹ Kablai is the abbreviated and colloquial form of ‘Karbala,’ a title given to a man who pays a visit to Kerbala, the place where the Holy Imām Husayn was martyred.